COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Volume III WINTER 1951 Number 1

Mohammedan Eschatology and Dante's Other World.
By Leonardo Olschki 1

The Integral Method of Literary Scholarship: Theses for Discussion.
By Manfred Kridl 18

Chaucer's Use of Lyric as an Ornament of Style.
By Arthur K. Moore 32

Pound, Laforgue, and Dramatic Structure.
By Warren Ramsey 47

China as a Symbol of Reaction in Germany, 1830-1880.
By Ernst Rose 57

Book Reviews 77

A Method of Interpreting Literature, by Leo Spitzer (D. A. Stauffer). *The Testament of Werther in Poetry and Drama*, by Stuart Pratt Atkins (Oskar Seidlin). *The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century*, by Frances A. Yates (R. V. Merrill). Modern Library College Editions (C.B.B.). *Criticism and Creation: Yale French Studies*, ed. by Kenneth Douglas (A.W.). *Letterature comparate*, ed. by Attilio Momigliano et al. (W.P.F.). *La Concorde des deux langages*, by Jean Lemaire de Belges, ed. by Jean Frappier (P. P. Morphos). *Mesa*, ed. by Herbert Steiner (Helen Adolf). *Byron, Hobhouse and Foscolo*, by E. R. P. Vincent (Fredi Chiappelli). *Bibliography of Comparative Literature*, by Fernand Baldensperger and W. P. Friederich (R.W.). J. J. Rousseau en Angleterre au XVIII[e] siècle, by Henri Roddier (L. I. Bredvold). *Dante and Virgil*, by J. H. Whitfield (Bettie Mae H. Payne).

Books Received 96

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature Section of the Modern Language Association of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the postoffice at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor

CHANDER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor

WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Editorial Board

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D. C.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

VICTOR LANGE
Cornell University
Ithaca, N. Y.

AUSTIN WARREN
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Mich.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, movements, genres, periods, and authors —from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on comprehensive topics and on problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00. Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: Univerity of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME III WINTER 1951 NUMBER 1

MOHAMMEDAN ESCHATOLOGY AND DANTE'S OTHER WORLD

LEONARDO OLSCHKI

SHORTLY before his death Miguel Asín Palacios, the great Spanish Arabist, published a reprint of his famous book on *La escatología musulmana en la Divina Commedia* (Madrid-Granada, 1943), supplemented by a survey of the discussions raised by the first edition in 1919. For several years thereafter Danteans and Orientalists alike were involved in a controversy over the supposed Hispano-Arabic sources of the *Divine Comedy*.

In glancing through this substantial survey, the reader is at once struck by two facts: first, the extent of the debate throughout the republic of letters; and, second, the tense and passionate mood in which the matter has been discussed in different countries and circles without a general agreement ever being reached. Very few literary polemics carried on internationally between the two world wars reveal so clearly the psychological and cultural background of some contemporary trends of scholarship.

The controversy over the Islamic sources of Dante's poem has been vitiated and misled since the very beginning by the national and professional pride with which it was inaugurated.[1] Asín's purpose to claim for Spain, even if Moorish, a considerable amount of Dante's glory, and his insistence on this sentiment, induced that great scholar to overesti-

[1] *La escatología musulmana en la Divina Commedia*, ed. cit., pp. 2 and 420; *El Islam cristianizado* (Madrid, 1931), pp. 116 f.

mate his findings and to magnify his conclusions. Supported by the almost unanimous consent of Orientalists who were less acquainted with Dante and his work, Asín attributed the general rejection of his thesis by Italian scholars to a sort of patriotic conspiracy intended to keep intact the poet's national and Christian figure in the centennial celebration of his death.[2]

Although somehow preposterous, this suspicion seemed justified in view of the consistency, and even violence, of the Italian criticism. In reality the Italians were well aware of the general ignorance and lack of interest of their mediaeval ancestors with regard to Mohammedan theology and religion. This mediaeval attitude has been recently confirmed and illustrated by Ugo Monneret de Villard, a learned and impartial scholar, whose essay on the subject does away with Asín's exaggerations and speculations but calls the attention of mediaevalists to some authentic and neglected expressions of Christian interest in Mohammedan eschatology.[3]

Long before this, however, the idea of Dante's taking inspiration for the structure and scenery of his other world from a nonexistent Latin translation of Ibn Arabī's *al-futūhāt-al-Makkiyya* had appeared fictional and even absurd.[4] When the contention died down, it left behind among Dante scholars a disturbing feeling of uneasiness and annoyance, while Asín and his adherents held stubbornly to their theory without adding new evidence to their problematic conclusions. For an Italian Dante authority, the uncritical acceptance of that theory was a mark of poor scholarship or an expression of charlatanism, characteristic of what Valdimiro Zabughin once designated as the "mala genía dei volgarizzatori."[5] At the same time leading Orientalists, such as T. W. Arnold in London and A. Guillaume in Durham, declared that Dante's direct imitation of Ibn 'Arabī was beyond doubt and embraced the general frame of the *Divina Commedia* as well as single episodes and, even more, its spiritual substance.[6]

After a deadlock of almost thirty years the well-known Italian Orien-

---

[2] *La escatología musulmana*, pp. 472 ff.

[3] Ugo Monneret de Villard, *Lo studio dell'Islām in Europa nel XII e XIII secolo* (Città del Vaticano, 1944; Studi e Testi No. 110), pp. 23-30, 45 f., 59 f., and *passim*.

[4] As a possible mediator between Dante and the mystic authors of Moorish Spain, Asín Palacios mentioned Brunetto Latini (*op. cit.*, pp. 371 ff.), while P. Mandonnet attributed Dante's supposed knowledge of Mohammedan eschatology to the Dominican missionary Ricoldo of Montecroce (see Villard, *op. cit.*, p. 54 note 2). None of these suggestions have a serious historical foundation. Latini devoted only a few insignificant words to Mohammed in his *Livres dou Trésor* (see critical ed. by Francis J. Carmody, University of California Press, 1948, p. 69).

[5] "Dante e l'Oriente," *Roma e l'Oriente*, XXI (1921), 7 ff. (a valuable article overlooked by Asín Palacios and all other scholars involved in this discussion).

[6] Asín Palacios, *Escatología*, pp. 493 f.

talist, Enrico Cerulli, has recently thrown a ponderous volume[7] into the no man's land between the two parties. This event revives on a new basis the unsolved question of the Mohammedan sources of Dante's poem and of Islamic influence on mediaeval literature and Christian eschatology. One of the most surprising documents of this influence is the *Book of the Ladder* or *Kitāb al-Miʿrāj*, which diffusely narrates the legendary journey of Mohammed through the realms of punishment and bliss. This rather dull and somewhat confused description of Hell and Paradise, as shown by the Archangel Gabriel to the Prophet, belongs to the uncanonical Mohammedan literature of the Middle Ages devoted to eschatological subjects and visionary tales. In the Western world the book was considered as a sacred text of Islam composed by Mohammed himself. Nevertheless, it escaped the attention of the learned Asín Palacios, whose work contains the most circumstantial history of Arabic literature on Mohammed's nocturnal journey through the other world.[8]

Although the *Book of the Ladder* gives the traditional episodes of Mohammed's legendary ascent, it lacks Ibn 'Arabī's philosophical weight, poetical tone, and mystical aura, which suggested Dante's supposed interest in his work. It was the popular character of the *Book of the Ladder* that determined its lasting success among Moslems and Christians alike. While Ibn 'Arabī's work hardly became known outside of some provincial and esoteric groups in Moorish Spain, the *Book of the Ladder* was widely read in the late Middle Ages and was printed in Venice as late as 1495 in the abridgment of an Italian Minorite. At the other end of the world an Uigur version of the text was transcribed in Afghanistan, around 1436, in a beautifully illuminated manuscript written for Tamerlane's son and successor.[9]

But the most impressive evidence of its popularity in the Middle Ages and of the keen interest of Dante's contemporaries in eschatological

[7] E. Cerulli, *Il Libro della Scala e la questione delle fonti arabo-spagnuole della Divina Commedia* (Città del Vaticano, 1949; Studi e Testi No. 150), 574 p., 15 plates. Almost at the same time a Spanish edition of the same text appeared under the title *La Escala de Mahoma. Traducción del árabe al castillano, latín y francés*, by José Muñoz Sendino (Madrid, 1949), xxv, 561 p., 2 plates. On this edition see G. Levi della Vida, "Nuova luce sulle fonti islamiche della Divina Commedia," *Al-Andalus*, XIV (1949), 377-407. When I wrote the present article this edition was not yet available to me, so that I have had to confine my remarks on the *Book of the Ladder* as a supposed source of the *Divina Commedia* to the material collected by Dr. Cerulli.

[8] The book was ignored by all Arabists until Monneret de Villard (*op. cit.*, pp. 53 f.) called attention to it. This mention of the two manuscripts containing the French and Latin versions induced Dr. Cerulli, and probably also his Spanish competitor, to publish the texts in two independent editions.

[9] Fourteen of the fifteen plates which adorn Cerulli's edition show as many episodes of Mohammed's journey, and represent an important contribution to the knowledge of Islamic iconography and the history of post-Timurid Turco-Persian art.

visions of that kind and origin is given by its translation into three Western languages and by numerous allusions and quotations to be found in the most diversified works of late mediaeval literature. They are all collected in Cerulli's book, which is mainly devoted to these aspects of the question. We learn from it that two men were instrumental in the propagation of the Arabic book in the Christian sphere. The first was a Jewish physician, Abraham by name, an intimate of King Alfonso X, *el Sabio*, who translated the book into Spanish in 1264 at the king's command. The other was a Tuscan exile, Bonaventura of Siena, who rendered the Spanish version into French and Latin.

Of this polyglot Italian writer nothing is authentically known, but it can be presumed that he met Brunetto Latini at the court of Castile where he was employed as a notary and scribe. As for the Jewish physician, Dr. Cerulli has collected some evidence of his literary activity and professional authority in the inner circle of the king's scholarly collaborators.[10] This identification is remarkable because of the frequency of the name Abraham among the Jewish physicians, scientists, and translators active in thirteenth-century Spain.[11] Unfortunately Abraham's Castilian version seems to be lost. An abridgment in that language, published in Cerulli's book, was once attributed to St. Pedro Pascual, but was probably written by a Rabbi Amer of Burgos, converted to Catholicism in 1295.[12]

Cerulli also gives the complete French and Latin texts by Bonaventura from a Bodleian manuscript and the Lat. 6064 of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, together with the readings of an incomplete Vatican version written in the early years of the fourteenth century. Thus, a modern philologist is able to read in different versions the story of Mohammed's ascent and to investigate its episodes without relying on Asín Palacios' critical condensation of Ibn 'Arabī's narrative. In this complete display of Mohammedan eschatology we may follow the Prophet and his guide climbing the ladder that leads him through eight heavens to the angelic hosts, the throne of God, and the earthly Paradise.

In a crude mixture of transcendent imagination and dry didacticism, the book describes the wonders of Heaven, the delightful sights of Paradise, the seas, rivers, plants, and treasures of the other world, and then,

[10] *Op. cit.*, pp. 17 ff. Abraham "Alfaquím" (i.e. *al-hakīm*), the physician, translated also the astronomical treatise of az-Zarqāli and the *Cosmography* of Ibn Haytam (Alhazen). See *ibid.*, p. 526 and, for these authors, G. Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science*, I (1931), 721, 758.

[11] Lynn Thorndike, "More Abrahamism," *Isis*, XI (1949), 34 f., and the remarks of Levi della Vida, *loc. cit.*, p. 380, note 3. Another Abraham, a physician from Tolosa, is mentioned as a contemporary translator (together with Simon of Genoa) of the *Liber de Medicamentis simplicibus* by Serapion, Jr., printed in 1473. On this text and author see G. Sarton, *op. cit.*, II (1931), 229.

[12] Cerulli, *op. cit.*, pp. 264 ff. and 327 f.

on the downward way, the forelands of Hell and its fire, monsters, torments, and divisions, the bridge Azirat over which the souls have to pass, and "plusours autres choses qe i sunt" which would be too long to enumerate in detail. There is in this description of the other world a determined attempt to rationalize its structure, both scientifically and according to a moral system, which marks the essential difference between these elaborate visions of the later Middle Ages and the early Christian apocalyptical and eschatological treatises.

There is no doubt that this systematic remaking of the picturesque and voluptuous Paradise of the Koran reflects the trend toward a scientific theology, developed around A.D. 1000 by Avicenna the Persian and concluded shortly before 1200 by Averroes, the Spanish Moor of Córdoba. This scientific theology is the spiritual manifestation of thinkers who were, as was usual, physicians, astronomers, and cosmographers, and sought God in nature as well as in the Koran, or even without it. It was the same spirit that, in the Christian sphere, helped to build up Aquinas' system and Dante's three realms beyond the grave. Alfonso X was, in the secular field, the representative of this peculiar intellectual attitude embodied in the physicians, scientists, and literati who crowded his court much as they had flocked, a little earlier, to the residence of Frederick II in Sicily. It is certain that the transformation of the chaotic Christian other world into an orderly section of the universe took place under the same circumstances as those which placed Mohammed's garden of pleasure within a measurable cosmographical system of spheres and a corresponding hierarchy of angels. In both cases the visionary other world of the early Middle Ages took on a scientific shape through the adaptation of the heavenly host to the Ptolemaic system of the world.

This common intellectual trend explains the vague structural affinities between the monuments of eschatological literature in the late mediaeval commonwealth of culture. The question of similarities in episodes and details is a different one, and should be considered apart from the preconceptions and fallacies which led Asín's investigations of Arabic eschatological traditions to his challenging and misleading conclusions.

Dr. Cerulli has enumerated the analogies between the *Book of the Ladder* and the *Divina Commedia*. He points out that Gabriel the Archangel has in the former the function attributed to Virgil in the latter, and mentions (pp. 524-525) the parallelism of topics in the didactic sections of the two works and the coincidence of some details in the descriptions of the infernal scenery, torments, and episodes. There is likewise a striking conformity in the organization of the earthly Paradise, its springs and rivers, its protecting frame of purifying fire, the tree of happiness, and the symbolism inherent in these aspects of an enchanted garden. Finally, the structure of the mystical rose of the blessed in Dante's Empyrean seems to have its counterpart in Mohammed's

seventh heaven thickly peopled with singing angels diving into an ocean of light.

Several circumstances support the impression that Dante might have drawn direct inspiration from an Arabic source accessible to the Christian reader in two literary languages of general knowledge. This opinion might be upheld by the evidence collected by Cerulli of the interest taken by twelfth-century Christian authors in Mohammedan eschatology.[13] Moreover, in Dante's lifetime some outstanding members of the school of Oxford, as well as Duns Scotus, Raymundus Lullus, and Ricoldus of Montecroce, participated in the discussions of Mohammedan philosophers about the reality and structure of the other world.[14]

The idea of a journey of the soul through Heaven and Hell had already inspired a philosophical allegory written in Sicily at the end of the twelfth century under local Arabic influence.[15] This circumstance might have determined the success of the *Book of the Ladder* and the general interest in Mohammedan eschatology, as shown for instance by Fazio degli Uberti, the great-grandson of the immortal Farinata.[16] In his dry and learned *Dittamondo*, written in imitation of Dante's poem shortly after 1350, the Hispano-Arabic treatise is mentioned as a book composed by Mohammed himself and is quoted for a description of his Paradise.

Yet, in discussing all these facts and circumstances, Dr. Cerulli always maintains his self-control and grants his readers the benefit of the doubt. He never draws hasty conclusions from the apparent analogies between the episodes, traits, and topics of the *Divina Commedia* and those contained in its supposed Mohammedan source. He never fails to call for a cautious appreciation of their comparative value and always refers to Biblical texts and Christian literature which could have inspired the same visions of Dante's poetical imagination.[17] If these cues

[13] *Op. cit.*, chap. xv.

[14] *Ibid.*, chap. xix ff.

[15] See M. Th. d'Alverny, "Les Pérégrinations de l'âme dans l'autre monde d'après un anonyme de la fin du XII[e] siècle," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age*, XIII (1940-42), 239-300.

[16] The passage is quoted and illustrated by Cerulli, *op. cit.*, pp. 354 ff. It should be kept in mind that this interest of poets and laymen in Mohammedan eschatology was directed chiefly to Mohammed's delightful Paradise, which acquired an understandable popularity although—or because—it had been considered since its first mention in a Christian text as a "lupanar and locus obscenissimus" (*ibid.*, p. 370).

[17] Dr. Cerulli could have found many more Biblical and mediaeval parallels independent of Mohammedan sources if he had consulted the diligent work of Dr. August Ruegg, *Die Jenseitsvorstellungen vor Dante und die übrigen literarischen Voraussetzungen der Divina Commedia* (Einsiedeln-Köln, 1945), especially pp. 435-463, where every episode attributed by Asín Palacios to Mohammedan models is discussed in the light of the Scriptures and according to classical and mediaeval texts. More material has been collected also by Rudolph Palgen, in *Das Quellenproblem der Göttlichen Komödie* (Heidelberg, 1930), *Das mittelalterliche Gesicht der Göttlichen Komödie* (1933), and other contributions on the same problem.

and suggestions appear sufficiently conclusive, the contributions of Mohammedan eschatology to Dante's work seem more and more problematic or indiscernible. This result may be illustrated by a few characteristic examples and some contributions from works not mentioned in Cerulli's thoroughgoing discussions.

Asín Palacios had already striven to prove that the gigantic cock which covers Mohammed's Heaven in most of its descriptions and, accordingly, also in the *Book of the Ladder*, was the direct model for Dante's angelic and imperial eagle which fills with its wings and glory the sixth of his heavens.[18] But apart from Ambrosius' and Prudentius' praise of the cock as a *mirabilis Dei creatura*, there are many symbolic eagles in the Bible from which the poet might have taken over the idea of his *santo uccello* without transforming a cock into a heavenly symbol of divine and royal justice.[19] It would be more suitable to the purpose if Arabists would explain from Mohammedan sources that curious deification of a cock, instead of carrying out a comparison between incongruous eschatological and poetical elements.

The same can be said (and has been said long since) about the ladder, the bridge, the tree, and other requisites of every staging of the other world attempted in the many Oriental and Western descriptions of its wonders and oddities.[20] Nor did it escape the earlier students of Dante's sources that most of these eschatological elements exist in the stories of celestial journeys of souls and seers since the Apocalypse of St. Paul popularized them at least three centuries before the Hegira.[21] Even the term *Scala Paradisi* had been familiar to Western readers of ascetic and mystic books after a treatise of this title, composed in France in the eleventh century, experienced a revival just when Friar Roberto Caracciolo inserted the *Scala Mahometi* into his Italian *Mirror of the Faith*.[22]

[18] *Escatología*, pp. 50 ff.; Cerulli, *op. cit.*, pp. 527 ff. Dante describes his celestial eagle in *Paradiso*, XIX, 1 ff.

[19] Ezek. 17:3 (the great eagle with great wings); Isa. 40:31; Matt. 24:38; Rev. 4:7.

[20] See the literature quoted above in note 17; and for the single topics see Howard R. Patch, *The Other World* (Cambridge, Mass., 1950), something like a comprehensive survey of the whole field, with a valuable bibliography.

[21] See Theodore Silverstein, *Visio Sancti Pauli* (London, 1935), and the studies of the same authors on "Dante and the Visio Sancti Pauli," *MLN*, XLVIII (1932), 387 ff.; "The Source of a Provençal Version of the Vision of St. Paul," *Speculum*, VIII (1933), 353 ff.; "The Passage of the Souls to Purgatory," *Harvard Theol. Review*, XXXI (1938), 53 ff.; and, for other episodes and visions, "The Throne of the Emperor in Dante's Paradiso," *ibid.*, XXXII (1939), 115 ff. On the Apocalypse of St. Paul see also Asín Palacios, *Escatología*, pp. 281 ff., and R. Rüegg, *op. cit.*, I. 255 ff., where the ancient sources of many of these early Christian visions of the other world are discussed in detail; and Silverstein, "Did Dante Know the Vision of Saint Paul?" in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, XIX (1937).

[22] On the *Scala Paradisi* (or *Claustralium*), attributed to St. Bernard and others, see Dom A. Wilmart, O.S.B., *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen*

One of the most impressive parallels between the Mohammedan otherworld lore and Dante's vision is the stupendous image of the heavenly city of angels and blessed arranged in a luminous amphitheater in sight of the throne of God and described by Dante as a celestial rose.[23] Asín's attempt to make this divine flower shoot forth from Ibn 'Arabī's tree of Paradise is certainly one of his less convincing ventures.[24] The reappearance of this all-embracing structure of the heavenly city in the *Book of the Ladder* is still considered by its editor "a distant and faint starting point" of Dante's vision.[25]

Curiously enough, in an Ethiopic version of the Apocalypse of the Virgin, Her last steps toward the realm of the blessed lead Her to their *civitatem sicut rosam constructam*, whose borders are secret and whose foundations are unknown.[26] Since none of the extant manuscripts of this apocalypse are older than the seventeenth century and none of its older versions contain any trace of the rose city of Heaven as it appears in the Ethiopian text, Dr. Silverstein of the University of Chicago attributes the striking similarity of that vision in the Italian poem and in the Ethiopic homily to an indirect borrowing from Dante, presumably introduced into Ethiopia by the Venetian painter Niccolò Brancaleone, who accompanied a famous Portuguese embassy to Prester John, the emperor of Abyssinia. Since this artist influenced the religious iconography of that distant Christian country, it seems reasonable to admit some literary mediation of the kind and an indirect borrowing from the Italian poem. But it would be strange, indeed, and totally inexplicable if Dante's influence on Ethiopian literature were confined to just this one detail.

It seems more sensible to associate this Coptic text with Arabic apocalyptic literature and its descriptions of Paradise as a symmetrical heavenly structure traversed by rivers of light and peopled by singing angels.[27] However, the simile of the rose never appears in these Arabic texts. It may be an accidental parallel in the Ethiopian apocalypse and in Dante's poem. In dealing with Asín Palacios' book, one of the most competent Islamists of our time has explained these coincidences as psychological parallelisms which he considers more probable than any direct *emprunt littéral*.[28] Fortunately, there is no need to discuss here

âge latin (Paris, 1932), pp. 230 ff., and Phyllis Hodgson, "A Ladder of Four Ranges, etc.," *MLR*, XLIV (1949), 465 ff. For Caracciolo's text see Cerulli, *op. cit.*, pp. 360 ff.

[23] *Paradiso*, XXX, 117; XXXI, 1

[24] *Escatología*, pp. 225 ff.

[25] Cerulli, *op. cit.*, pp. 538 f.

[26] See Theodore Silverstein, "Dante's Heavenly Rose: an Analogue or a Borrowing," *Harvard Theol. Review*, XLIII (1949), 149 ff.

[27] Asín Palacios, *op. cit.*, p. 212; Cerulli, *op. cit.*, pp. 90 ff.

[28] L. Massignon, "Les Études islamiques à l'étranger," *Revue du Monde Musulman*, XXXVI (1919), 23 ff.

this fundamental problem of comparativism. Human ideas are spread over the world like pollen carried by the wind and may sprout anywhere "like grain of spelt," as Dante says. The Ethiopic version of Mary's Ascension does not seem a fertile ground for this kind of poetical seed.

Nor should Dante's model of the heavenly rose be sought in exotic works of which he probably had no direct knowledge and which never contained an image of that sort. The whole external and symbolic structure of Dante's heavenly city can easily be reconnected with Biblical figures, the system of Pseudo Dionysius Areopagite, and the Neoplatonic revival in the Christian mystical literature of the late Middle Ages.[29]

The image of the heavenly rose could have been suggested by the treatise *De Rosa* written in the thirteenth century by Petrus de Mora, cardinal of Capua, who conceived of the *chorus martyrum* as a rose with all the attributes given by Dante to the realm of his *milizia santa* in the thirtieth canto of the *Paradiso*.[30] All these images, including the Ethiopic heavenly rose, developed from the very symbol and designation of the Virgin as a flower in mediaeval liturgy and poetry.[31] Her heavenly reign over the saints and martyrs displays its glory in the very form suggested by the name and attribute of its Queen.

When compared with the dryness, crudity, and pedestrian character of the Mohammedan eschatology as represented by the *Book of the Ladder*, those Biblical and Christian texts and figures have a metaphorical range, an intensity of accent, and a visionary depth as fascinating and stirring as the *Book of the Ladder* is insipid and tedious. These stylistic concerns should never be neglected in investigations of sources and models of a poetic masterpiece. No literary alchemy can transform dust into gold. One can understand that such a dry and unimaginative poet as Fazio degli Uberti, or Frederico Frezzi, the author of the *Quadriregio*, was attracted by some aspects of the Mohammedan other world.[32] I would even suppose that Guillaume de Deguilleville, the French contemporary of these Italian didactic poets, could have found in the *Book of the Ladder*, besides the ubiquitous *Roman de la Rose*, the outline of his successful *Pèlerinage de l'âme*.[33] But to people aware of the essential aspects of the mediaeval world and the intimate sources of Dante's in-

[29] See my article, "Sacra Doctrina e Theologia Mystica: Il Canto XXX del Paradiso," *Giornale Dantesco*, XXXVI (1935), 1-23.

[30] *Spicilegium Solesmiense* (Paris, 1855), III, 489 ff.

[31] See C. Jorey, *La Rose dans l'antiquité et au moyen âge* (Paris, 1892) and *Paradiso*, XXXIII, 7-9. A. Salzer, *Die Sinnbilder und Beiworte Mariens* (Linz, 1893), pp. 183-192 and *passim*, collects numerous examples of this symbol, mainly from mediaeval Latin hymns and patristic literature in which the concepts of Maria as "coeli rosa" or "flos Paradisi" are expressed in many variations.

[32] Cerulli, *op. cit.*, pp. 540 ff.

[33] Published by Stürzinger, London, Roxburghe Club, 1895. See A. Farinelli, *Dante e la Francia* (Milano, 1908), I, 147 ff.

spiration, the idea of the poet imagining his transcendent journey in imitation of Mohammed's ascension will never be plausible, no matter how striking some analogies may appear. Neither Asín Palacios' dialectical ability nor Cerulli's painstaking illustration of these affinities can make the opinion of a competitive undertaking more convincing or even simply acceptable.[34]

One of the greatest fallacies in the discussion of this problem consists in the assumption of an alleged sympathy or familiarity of Dante with Mohammedan doctrines and civilization. Cerulli has reduced to correct proportions Asín's insistent overestimation of the poet's interest in Islamic thought and poetry.[35] We know now that all references to, and quotations from, Mohammedan authors in Dante's works are borrowed from Albert the Great or Thomas Aquinas.[36] It should be added that none of these references or allusions ever concerns any special feature of Mohammedan literature or religion. If the mention of 'Alī in *Inferno* XXVIII, 32 seems to contradict this assertion, it should be borne in mind that this cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet was known in the Western world in connection with the half-legendary figure of the Old Man of the Mountain, the Great Master of the Assassins, who, as Joinville stated, "ne créoit pas en Mahommet, ainçois créoit en la loi de Haali."[37] The schism provoked by his cult among the Mohammedans was well known to the Dominican Yves le Breton, Marco Polo, and some chroniclers of the Crusades.[38] The figure of the chief of the sect was so popular that allusions to him in early Provençal poetry could be understood, as has been recently shown, without explanation.[39] It is more probable that Dante learned about 'Alī and his schismatic cult through these legendary channels rather than from direct Mohammedan sources or any treatise on Ismailic doctrines and the mystical power of the Imām.

[34] Cerulli's conclusive remarks at the end of his volume express the opinion that Dante intended to oppose a Christian vision of the other world to Mohammed's ascension as described in what was considered a second sacred book of Islam.

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 507 ff. I went even further in my article on "Dante e l'Oriente," *Giornale Dantesco*, XXXIX (1938), overlooked by Cerulli.

[36] The authors indirectly known to Dante and quoted in his works are, in his spelling, Albumasar, Alfraganus, Algazali, Alpetragius (i.e., al-Bitrūjī), Averroes, and Avicenna. On these authors see G. Sarton, *op. cit.*, vol. II, and C. A. Nallino, *Raccolta di scritti editi ed inediti*, 6 vols. (Rome, 1944-1948).

[37] Jean sire de Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis*, ed. M. Natalis de Wailly, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1874), pp. 250 ff., where some points of the doctrines attributed to 'Alī are mentioned as characteristic of Assassins and Bedouins.

[38] See Charles E. Nowell, "The Old Man of the Mountain," *Speculum*, XXII (1947), 497-519.

[39] See Frank M. Chambers, "The Troubadours and the Assassins," *MLN*, LXIV (1949), 245-247. To the material collected in this article one could add the mention of the Assassins in the first sonnet of the *Fiore*, once attributed to Dante and published in an appendix of his *Opere*, ed. by the Società Dantesca Italiana (Florence, 1921).

What early commentators have to say about the mention of 'Alī in the famous episode of the *Inferno* confirms the general ignorance of his historical and doctrinal background.[40]

This ignorance does not contradict the profound penetration of the mediaeval mind by Arabic thought, science, and literature. The influence of Avicenna, the impact of Averroes, and the effect of other Mohammedan philosophers on Western civilization were so powerful that the intellectual accomplishments of Thomas Aquinas and the monastic reorganization of schools and learning hardly succeeded in stemming the tide overflowing the Christian systems of dogmas and beliefs. Averroism, condemned by Mohammedans and Christians alike, spread from the Sicilian court to the provincial residences of imperial vicars as a sort of Ghibelline philosophy, and settled down in the Universities of Naples and Padua as a manifestation of secular and independent thought.[41] How deeply Dante's mind was affected by this intellectual current has been shown by E. Gilson and Bruno Nardi[42] in numerous contributions to the knowledge of contemporary philosophical culture.

But the high esteem in which the Arab philosophers were held by Dante and his friends, and the affinity discovered in their works and doctrines by Christian thinkers, did not depend upon any agreement with Mohammedan tenets and beliefs. The admiration for, and the exploitation of, the Arab philosophers never mitigated the universal Christian hatred of the Prophet, his deeds, his "law," his mosques and schools, and the religious literature of his adherents. The absorption of the vast influx of Arabic thought by the Christian world in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries took place on such a large scale because the bulk and essence of that philosophical and scientific literature were by no means a Mohammedan legacy, but rather the epilogue and revival of Greek and Hellenistic philosophy and science assimilated and handed down by Arabs of all climates and sects. In other words, the Western world Christianized the Greeks and not the Arabs, after the great Mohammedan philosophers had striven to reconcile the teachings of Mohammed with the doctrines of Aristotle, Plato, and the Neoplatonic school.

Dante expressed this fact symbolically by mentioning Avicenna and Averroes in the retinue of the Greek philosophers and scientists gathered

[40] To the example given by Francesco Buti and mentioned by Cerulli (p. 508, note 2), more could be added from other early commentators up to Cristoforo Landino. See also Alessandro d'Ancona, "La leggenda di Maometto in Occidente," *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, XIII (1889).

[41] See L. Olschki, *The Genius of Italy* (New York, 1949), chap. VI.

[42] E. Gilson, *Dante the Philosopher* (New York, 1949), pp. 168 ff., 212 ff.; B. Nardi, *Nel mondo di Dante* (Rome, 1944), pp. 210 ff., and other essays by the same author mentioned in the notes. Also, for some particular aspects of this philosophy in the poetry of the *dolce stil nuovo*, see J. E. Shaw, *Guido Cavalcanti's Theory of Love* (Toronto, 1949).

on the fresh meadow around the "noble castle" of the arts.[43] The familiarity rapidly acquired by Christian theologians with these heathen and Mohammedan thinkers depended upon the affinity of doctrines and methods which reconnected them with the early fathers of the Church, Greek and Latin alike. The Aristotelian and Platonic revival in this era was not the result of an adaptation of a Mohammedan theology to Christian tenets, but a return of the Western mind to the classical sources of intellectual enlightenment that had once directed the spiritual efforts of the early Churchmen in the first Councils and later on of religious leaders in synagogues, schools, and *madāris*. Individually, the new Aristotelianism of the high Middle Ages resumed in the Christian field the traditions of Tertullian and Boethius, whereas St. Augustine had kept alive the Platonic trends equally revived, with Arabic mediation, in the era of flowering scholasticism.

This fact, and the whole problem of such borrowings from doctrinal texts, may be illustrated by a striking example ignored by Asín Palacios and neglected by Dr. Cerulli. The only Arabic book that Dante certainly knew directly, in a Latin translation, and repeatedly quoted in his *Convivio*, is the treatise *De Causis*, intensely studied by leading contemporary theologians such as Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, and many others.[44] From this work Dante admittedly drew two fundamental elements of his poetic and doctrinal inspiration: the theory of earthly and mystical love, as discussed in the *Convivio* (III, ii, 4; vi, 4) and accepted by the *fedeli d'amore* of the "sweet new style," and the "metaphysics of light" that permeates his vision of Paradise.[45]

Only a few of his contemporaries knew that this very influential treatise was the work of an Arabic writer. It was generally attributed to Aristotle, although it is as far from the doctrines of the Stagirite as a Neoplatonic emanatistic system of theology can be. In fact, Thomas Aquinas recognized in the work an abridged translation of the *Principles of Theology* by Proclus, the fifth-century synthesizer of Neoplatonic doctrines. It is by virtue of these very doctrines, familiarized by St. Augustine and Pseudo Dionysius Areopagite, and not by any Mohammedan contribution, that the little book became so popular that it affected the feelings and imagination of a whole generation of Italian poets

[43] *Inferno*, IV, 130-134. The great Islamic philosophers since al-Fārābī and al-Kindī were always aware of the dependence of their doctrines and methods on their Greek forerunners and models. See, on this point, R. Walzer, "The Rise of Islamic Philosophy," *Oriens*, III (1950), 1-19.

[44] For this treatise, and literature on it, see the article cited above in note 29; and also the critical edition of Dante's *Convivio* by G. Busnelli and G. Vandelli (1939), I, 264, note. On the possible author of the treatise and on its sources and influence see Manuel Alonso, S.J., "El Liber de Causis," *Al-Andalus*, IX (1944), 43 ff., and X (1945), 429 ff.

[45] See Rocco Murari, "Il *De Causis* e la sua fortuna nel Medio Evo," *Giornale storico della lett. ital.*, XXXIV (1899), 93-117.

in the spirit of their master.[46] This circumstance shows that the deep interest of Dante's contemporaries in all kinds of Arab philosophers was not directed by any curiosity concerning Mohammedan doctrines and orthodoxy, but exclusively by those aspects of Islamic literature which, in their turn, are a manifestation of a common intellectual background, Aristotelian or Platonic.

In the specific cases of Dante's theory of love and of his "metaphysics of light," it is unnecessary, and even unhistoric, to reconnect their poetic substantiation with Ibn 'Arabī, as Asín eloquently does, or with any other Mohammedan mystical writer.[47] Avicenna and all the ramifications of Neoplatonic emanatism in Arabic and Jewish literature gave doctrinal support to a concept already consecrated by early Christian theologians after Jesus had proclaimed himself as *lux mundi* and the embodiment of divine light.[48] All these doctrines were characteristic of contemporary Franciscan theologians and were systematically collected in the treatise *De Luce*, composed in 1280 by Bartolomeo da Bologna, a Minorite professor of theology in the university of that town.[49] There is no reason to insist on the eschatological offspring of Mohammedan theology or to refer to Arabic scientific authors in order to explain Dante's familiarity with these concepts and the inspiration he could have drawn from them.

This conclusion should not minimize the importance of Arabic science and literature in Western civilization. Their impact, as indicated above, cannot be overestimated. It affects the most characteristic manifestations of the intellectual revival of the thirteenth century. Dante agreed with his contemporaries in respect for, and exploitation of, Arabic science and philosophy, but he was, nevertheless, passionate and radical in rejecting and despising Mohammed the Prophet, his work and interpreters, and what was called his *deliramenta*, that is, everything directly inspired by the Koran or known from his authentic or fabulous biography. Nothing from these sources was ever allowed to influence the religious manifestations of Christian feelings and beliefs, no matter how

[46] Its impact on the philosophical mind of the thirteenth century is attested by its imitation and exploitation in the anonymous "Liber de Causis primis et secundis," published by R. de Vaux, O.P., in *Notes et textes sur l'avicennisme latin aux confins des XII^e-XIII^e siècles* (Paris, 1934), pp. 88-140. The treatise was attributed to Avicenna.

[47] It may be recalled that al-Ghazzālī's and Alfraganus' contributions to the emanatistic theory of light had been collected and summarized in the *Speculum Doctrinale* of Vincent of Beauvais (lib. XV, chap. 5), an author certainly known by Dante. The speculative interest in this subject was accompanied by scientific studies of optics promoted by a contemporary Latin translation of Alhazen's famous *Thesaurus Opticae* and the treatise on the same subject by Witelo. On these authors see Sarton, *op. cit.*, I, 721, and C. Bäumker, *Witelo: Ein Philosoph und Naturforscher des dreizehnten Jahrhundrets* (Münster, 1908).

[48] John 8: 12.

[49] Published by P. I. Squadrani, O.F.M., in *Antonianum*, VII (1932), fasc. 2-4.

many motifs of Arabic architecture and decoration abounded in churches and chapels or how many poetical topics might have inspired troubadours and story tellers in Christian Europe. There is no doubt that when King Alfonso commissioned his Jewish physician and his Italian official to translate the *Kitāb al-Miʿrāj*, he intended not to propagate it as a source of Christian inspiration or of literary enjoyment, but rather to use it as an instrument of controversy in his struggle against Mohammedan aberrations. That the king and his protégés succeeded in that attempt is shown by the author of the Spanish treatise *Sobre la seta mahometana*, in which the *Book of the Ladder* is summarized "porque entendais la gran nezedad de los que estonce le creyeron e agora le creen."[50]

Dante made the same distinction between the Arabs as depositories and mediators of ancient thought, on the one hand, and as adepts of a false religion, on the other. This is shown, respectively, by his reverent mention of their leading philosophers and the horrible punishment he inflicted on Mohammed as a sower of scandal and discord.[51] Only an outburst of implacable hatred could have suggested the vile words and repulsive images with which the poet made the Prophet the most abject figure of his *Inferno*. Dante not only deprived him of his natural dignity as a human being, but also denied him the historical function of a religious leader. It seems impossible, indeed, to reconcile these feelings with Dante's alleged interest in a sacred book of Islam describing the ascension of that malefactor to the throne of God and his apotheosis in the light of Heaven.

None of the analogies between Mohammedan and Dantean eschatology is striking and relevant enough to overcome the contrast between these two attitudes. Consequently there is no reason to add Mohammed's *miʿrāj* (ascension) to the inspiring prototypes of Dante's poetic and mystical journey. Dante revealed the authentic sources of his inspiration by mentioning his precursors at the beginning of his poem: Aeneas and his *descensus ad inferos* as desribed by Virgil, and St. Paul and his vision of the Christian other world.[52] He could say of himself:

> Io non Enea, io non Paolo sono.

Could he have added Mohammed as a third forerunner in his transcendent journey? In answering this question in the only possible way, one should consider that similarities of a structural and episodic character have no conclusive value against a totally discrepant background of faith, sentiment, and artistic inspiration.

---

[50] Cerulli, *op. cit.*, p. 265.
[51] *Inferno*, IV, 143 f., and XXVIII, 22-63, respectively.
[52] *Inferno*, II, 13-36.

The publication of the Latin and French translations of the *Kitāb al-Mi'rāj* has not only demolished the skillful architecture of Asín Palacios' assumptions, but has also contributed to the negative solution of the whole "questione delle fonti arabo-spagnuole della *Divina Commedia*." The analogies between the poem and Mohammedan eschatological literature should now be investigated in the common field of other-world speculations and not through a comparative discussion of single episodes separated from their spiritual and poetic context. The Koran had given the impulse to all these Mohammedan visions, although its data on the shape of Paradise and Hell are scanty and contradictory. Its famous description of Paradise has been for centuries one of the most controversial subjects of Mohammedan theology, as well as of Christian curiosity and vituperation.

Modern investigation of the Koranic sources has revealed how much Mohammed himself had drawn from apocalyptical treatises popular in his day in the heart and borderlands of Arabia.[53] The early Mohammedan visionary literature depended on Jewish, Christian, and Parsi sources of the same character and content. The angelology of Pseudo Dionysius Areopagite was known to the Arabs of Syria and Egypt as well as to the Christian fathers of the East and West.[54] The pagan Hell was a source of meditation for both. The further development of Mohammedan eschatological literature in the high Middle Ages seems to have been an accomplishment mainly of Spanish Moors living in a Christian and Mozarabic environment and therefore longer and more directly influenced by Christian and Biblical trends and motifs than their coreligionists of Asia.

Spain was for mediaeval Islam what Syria had been in the first centuries of the Hegira, and Persia around A.D. 1000. Asín Palacios revealed in three substantial volumes the *sentido cristiano* in the doctrines of Al-Ghazzālī, the Persian master of Mohammedan mystical theology.[55] Moreover, he studied in many of its aspects *el Islam cristianizado* as shown in the numerous works of Ibn 'Arabī, the Murcian.[56] It is only consistent to infer from these interrelations that the builders of the Mo-

[53] See J. Horowitz, "Mohammed's Himmelfahrt," *Der Islam*, IX (1908) 159 ff. (with many bibliographical references on the subject). The eminent Russian Turcologist, V. V. Barthold, pointed out that the spread of Islam among the heathen tribes of the Russian and Asiatic steppes was essentially due to the fascination exerted on those rugged nomads by tales of the other world as developed in the lower groups of Persian sūfism and the Mohammedan eschatology, both strongly influenced by Nestorian traditions and early Christian, Zoroastrian, and Manichean mythologies. See W. Barthold, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie centrale*, adaptation française par Mme M. Donskis (Paris, 1945), p. 57.

[54] See W. Eickmann, *Angelologie und Dämonologie des Korans* (Leipzig-New York, 1918).

[55] *La espiritualidad de Algazel y su sentido cristiano* (Madrid, 1939).

[56] *El Islam cristianizado: estudio del 'sufismo' a través de las obras de Abenarabi de Murcia* (Madrid, 1931).

hammedan other world in Moorish Spain worked on common ground with the authors of Christian eschatological literature of popular or learned character. In this, Ibn 'Arabī and the author of the *Book of the Ladder* would have continued a mythical and literary tradition already started by the Prophet himself and continued by his theologians and eschatological writers.

It is time now to start a systematic investigation of the Biblical, pagan, Koranic, Oriental, early Christian, and mediaeval sources of this Mohammedan eschatology. This task should be left entirely to Arabists particularly versed in the early religious literature of Islam and in the peculiar aspects of Spanish and Maghreb Mohammedanism. To avoid confusion and misleading conclusions, Dante should be left out of these investigations and his other world considered in the light of those traditions of faith and culture which represent the substance of his mind and the essential tissue of his intellectual formation.

Accordingly, Dr. Cerulli's most important contribution is the critical editing of the two translations which make up for the lost original of the *Book of the Ladder* and display most of the traditional motifs of Mohammedan eschatology. Students of Romance philology will find in the book a new text in Old French worth studying for its style, vocabulary, and possible influence on late mediaeval didactic literature. With the help of Muñoz' edition of the same work from the same manuscripts,[57] it will be possible to replace some readings of Cerulli's text which are obscure or puzzling,[58] despite the remarkable skill of this versatile Orientalist in the editing of a mediaeval text of unusual character and style. Italianists will have a new opportunity to study the activity of political exiles living in Spain and writing in French, such as Bonaventura of Siena, the author of this retranslation from a Hispano-Arabic text. They may be prompted to investigate the Hispano-Italian cultural relations which appear as scanty and aimless in the Middle Ages as they became intense and ubiquitous in later periods of European civilization.

Moreover, these translations of a religious book of the Arabs add a colorful element to the picture of King Alfonso's efforts towards a consistent understanding of human trends and interests in all branches of spiritual and intellectual life. This attitude of the learned king coincided with his imperial ambitions and claims at the height of his prestige. In this he followed the example of Frederick II, whose successor he strove to become, and inaugurated the tradition of learned kings which for three centuries added power and glory to the potentates of Europe.

For mediaevalists Cerulli has gathered the evidence of the widespread interest of Mohammedan and Christian theologians in the shape and sig-

[57] See note 7 above.
[58] See the remarks of G. Levi della Vida, *Nuova luce sulle fonti islamiche*, pp. 386 f.

nificance of the other world. The discussions on this topic carried on in schools and *madāris* during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries throw light on the discrepancies as well as on the affinities of approach, methods, and conclusions. The charming story of the three equal rings symbolizing the equivalence of the three Biblical religions[59] should not influence the discussion of these analogies, or exaggerate the mutual understanding of theologians in the three fields of faith and thought. As a matter of fact, if there has been almost at all times an *Islām cristianizado*, there has never been an Islamized Christianity in respect to its orthodoxy and soteriological system.[60]

The discrepancies between Christian and Mohammedan eschatology result mainly from the materialistic and hedonistic images of Paradise and the sectarian character of Hell conceived according to Koranic patterns, which was always bitterly opposed in all Christian literature on the subject. Conversely, the affinities appear in all evidence as the factual and logical consequences of the common foundations of the two creeds. Both Christianity and Mohammedanism are religions of salvation based on Biblical revelation and Hellenistic traditions of thought and culture. They developed a mythology which betrays the common origin rather than a mutual exchange of motifs and images.[61]

Under these circumstances it is surprising that the mythological analogies between the two systems of theology are so few and irrelevant.[62] A sober and critical comparison of the two texts shows that Mohammedan eschatology as displayed in the *Book of the Ladder* contributes nothing in any appreciable way to the structural and episodic scaffold of the *Divina Commedia* or to our historical and interpretative understanding of the poem.

Berkeley, California

---

[59] G. Boccaccio, *Il Decamerone*, I, 3.

[60] Even the Mozarabs of Spain, who had absorbed and spread Arabic culture and developed a liturgy and religious art of their own, did not develop heretical doctrines and movements, but preserved for many centuries an unimpeachable Catholic orthodoxy.

[61] Cf. P. J. Henninger, "Spuren christlicher Glaubenswahrheiten im Koran," *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, V (1949), 127 ff. and 290 ff.

[62] Cerulli, *op. cit.*, pp. 522 ff.

THE INTEGRAL METHOD OF LITERARY SCHOLARSHIP: THESES FOR DISCUSSION

MANFRED KRIDL

AS SUBTITLE and length indicate, this is not an elaborate exposition of the theory of a new method, but an attempt to stimulate the discussion of problems the importance of which can hardly be denied by any literary historian or critic.[1] The theses are here formulated in a deliberately radical form in order to force the problems to their final consequences and to instigate a lively reaction—which is far sounder than apathy. Like every theory, this one has its strengths and weaknesses, its assertions more or less evident and clear, and formulations that need further exposition, elaboration, or even revision. It is to be hoped that a general discussion will clarify our ends and contribute to the establishing of a really adequate literary discipline.[2]

The irony and even contempt with which the work of literary historians is treated by scholars in the physical sciences is partly justified by our lack of generally acknowledged methodological principles, by the absence of a strictly defined subject and a consequent lack of defined ends. These deficiencies must be acknowledged serious, for there can be no true discipline without a subject, a method, and an aim.

Let us take first the problem of the nature of literature and the subject of literary scholarship. By way of definition, we have and still get the most inexact, vague, and indeed fantastic statements. For Herder, literature means all works in which the spiritual physiognomy of a nation is reflected; for Friedrich Schlegel, it means those arts and sciences of which the subject is man and life. For Carrière, literary history is the history of "ideals"; for Hettner, it is the history of "ideas" and their scientific [*sic!*] and artistic forms; for W. Klemperer, it is the history of the incorporation in words of national ideas.[3] Thomas

[1] This paper was delivered, in slightly different form, as a lecture at the English Institute in Sept. 1948. It is based on the author's book, *Wstęp do badań nad dziełem literackiem* (Introduction to the Study of Literary Works, Wilno, 1936.)

[2] Toward this objective, an important contribution has recently been made by René Wellek and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature* (New York, 1949); but in my judgment the book suffers from occasional eclecticism and general moderation.

[3] W. N. Peretz, *Iz lekcyi po metodologyi istoryi russkoy literatury* (Lectures on Methodology of Russian Literary History, Kiev, 1914) quotes analogous opinions of Russian literary historians; Dashkevich, Kolmachevsky, Arhangelsky, and others.

Wharton thought of literature as transmitting to posterity genuine delineations of life; Henry Morley conceived of it as "the national biography" or the "story of the English mind"; Leslie Stephen regarded literature as "a particular function of the whole social organism"; W. J. Courthope defined "the study of English poetry as in effect the study of continuous growth of our national institutions as reflected in our literature." Lovejoy held that literature is "the history of ideas in dissolution"; Edwin Greenlaw, that "nothing related to the history of civilization is beyond our province"; F. W. Bateson, that literature "is unintelligible except in reference to something outside itself"; Sidney Lee, that literary history studies "the external circumstances—political, social, economic—in which literature is produced."[4]

From these examples, it might be concluded that literary history is a discipline concerned indiscriminately with everything, since such things as life, man, nation, ideas, ideals, and institutions are notions of indefinite scope. Serious students are forced to ask: Is a discipline dealing with *everything* possible?

According to Roman Jakobson, such literary historians are like police who, in order to arrest one person, would confiscate everything in his apartment and, in addition, round up all the casual passers-by on the street.[5] But the founder of phenomenology, Edmund Husserl, declared that a given discipline is an objective and closed unity and that the determination of its boundaries is not a matter of individual whims—is, indeed, immanent in the nature of the subject itself. The accumulation of heterogeneous subjects under pretended unities can only lead to false definitions of subjects, to the setting of unesssential goals, to the application of incoherent methods, and to the confusion of basic statements with those which are trivial or irrevelant.[6]

Less vague and confused are statements limiting the extent of literature and its history to works "beautifully written," distinguished by "form" (Lanson, Chmielowski) or by "imagination and sentiment" (Porębowicz). Other scholars define literature by its "relation to society," which means that to literature belongs every work addressed to the entire nation and not only to specialists (Paul, Lanson), or make a division between "belles lettres" and "literature," the latter including all writing (Nisard).[7]

Yet here we encounter a new difficulty—the so-called "beautiful form" and its equivalents cannot constitute *differentia specifica* of lit-

[4] See René Wellek, "Literary History," in *Literary Scholarship* (Chapel Hill, 1941), and Thomas Clark Pollock, *The Nature of Literature* (Princeton, 1942).

[5] *Nowyeyshaya russkaya poezya* (Modern Russian Poetry, Prague, 1921), p. 11.

[6] *Logische Untersuchungen* (Halle, 1922), I, 6 ff.

[7] More examples in Peretz, *op. cit.*, and Casimir Wójcicki, *Historja literatury i poetyka* (Literary History and Poetics, Warsaw, 1914).

erary works, because we can also find them in historical, philosophical, and critical works. How then are we to distinguish between such works and those which are the proper objects of literary scholarship? In practice, many literary historians consider it their duty to include in literary history at least historians, literary critics, and philosophers, if not representatives of other disciplines.

Another objection concerns the notion of beauty itself. Beauty in the classical sense of the word—e.g., harmony, proportion, and sublimity —cannot be applied to all aesthetic objects, that is, works of art; beauty embraces a narrower realm than aesthetically valuable artistic phenomena.

The only remedy against this confusion, it would seem, is to face boldly the fundamental problem of the definition of a literary work, and to agree that a literary work, exactly defined, is the central subject of literary scholarship.

The question of the definition of a literary work is not easy to answer; but we can, with the help of Croce, Walzel, Ingarden, and the Slavic "formalists" and "structuralists," determine at least some of the essential features of literary works differentiating them from all other works of the human mind.

What is the basic difference between a scientific and a literary work? The constituent elements of a scientific work, whether pertaining to the natural sciences or to the humanities, are—according to Ingarden[8]—almost exclusively assertions and judgments. Whether true or false, at any rate they lay claim to being true (*Wahrheitsanspruch*). Another of their properties consists in their being concerned with objectively existing states of things (*Sachverhalte*) or real objects. The aim, therefore, of a scientific work is a presentation of logically true judgments applying to objective phenomena. Other features, such as style and structure, are directed toward the same purpose.

In the case of a literary work, the situation is entirely different. Its sentences do not and should not pretend to be logical judgments; they do not apply to an objectively existing reality. They create a reality of another dimension, a fiction little concerned with the real world. They are only externally similar to proper judgments. Their place, indeed, is between ordinary utterances and judgments; they are "intentional" and "modified."[9] The same characterization, of course, applies to all characters, phenomena, objects, and processes appearing in literary works. Their reality is a specific one—an appearance of reality (*habitus*) rather than concrete reality itself. So also are space and time as they appear in literature.

[8] *Das literarische Kunstwerk* (Halle, 1931).
[9] Ingarden, *ibid.*, secs. 25 and 26.

Another feature sharply distinguishing literary works from other kinds of writing is their language. In general, we can distinguish three systems of language: the colloquial, the scientific, and the poetic or literary. The function of the first is the clear and prompt exposition of everyday affairs. The materials of the second are authentic judgments claiming to be true. The way of formulating them is, in principle, indifferent. It often happens that words are replaced by signs and mathematical symbols as correlatives of notions and assertions. The third, poetic or literary language, is the actual creator of fictitious reality. Lacking practical or scientific aims, it is relatively autonomous, is constructed according to artistic principles and subordinated to the general artistic conception, and possesses its own artistic value.

Finally, literary structure is one of the most essential elements of literary works. While in other works structure is only a secondary means of grouping the material in as clear a way as possible, in literary works it pervades all the elements—plot, "motifs," characters, events, style, and language. It serves its own literary, imaginative purposes, scantly relevant to structural processes in real life.

In this way we can, though of course roughly and incompletely, define the essential nature of literary works. Only such works should be the subject of literary scholarship, its aim being the investigation of those specific literary properties which distinguish literary works from all others.

Of course, nobody can refuse the literary historian the right to be concerned with nonliterary works of any kind, e.g., criticism, moral and political writings (the present writer has himself written a study of Lamennais and Mickiewicz). In such cases, however, he must realize that he is doing something else and not literary criticism. Almost ten years ago Allen Tate (*Reason in Madness,* p.10) posed the problem of subject matter in strong words: "... Are the scholars studying literature or are they not? That is the question. If they are not, why then do they continue to pretend that they are?"

Methods of investigation of literary works can be divided roughly into two kinds: extraliterary and literary.[10] To the first types of investigation belong those which are concerned not so much with the literary work itself as with its author and its environment—genetic, psychological, sociological, historical, and cultural. Such studies are descendants of philology and history (hence called philologico-historical); they embrace language, literature, and culture and treat them by means of genetics and psychology, considering literary works as cul-

[10] Zygmunt Lempicki calls the latter "ergocentric" (*Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft,* vol. II). Wellek and Warren's corresponding terms are "extrinsic" and "intrinsic."

tural documents and using as material everything concerned directly or indirectly with authors and their works.

The literary or ergocentric methods came into existence only about the beginning of our century—these methods call to mind the names of Benedetto Croce, Karl Vossler, Leo Spitzer, H. Sperber, the French *explication* (G. Rudler, M. Roustan, A. Albalat), English and American critics such as I. A. Richards, J. E. Spingarn, Middleton Murry, Edwin Muir, T. S. Eliot, Cleanth Brooks, J. C. Ransom, Allen Tate, René Wellek, Austin Warren, the German and English writers on versification, the Russian and Polish formalists, and the Czech structuralists.

It is clear, from the enumeration of these names, that the literary method is no more homogeneous than the extraliterary. In both there is a variety of attitudes, aspects, and application of methodic devices. Genetics, psychology, historico-cultural trends, eclecticism in mixing different points of view, moralizing—these are by no means absent from works of some representatives of the literary or "ergocentric" method.

It is not enough to be concerned with literary works alone. One must fulfill a number of other requirements as well in order to create a method rendering full justice to literary works, working in the closest connection with them and independent of all other methods. Such a method, which I call an integrally literary one, is, I believe, the most helpful in making literary scholarship into a discipline.

As *integral*, this method must embrace everything, without exception, that exists in a literary work; as *literary*, it must study all elements within the limits of the work from the literary point of view. The integrally literary approach will distinguish this method from all other possible, and impossible, approaches to literature, whether cultural, sociological, psychological, moral, utilitarian, or medical. In possessing our own exactly defined subject, in operating our own genuine and original method, we shall be released from eclecticism, from dependence upon various heterogeneous methods, from imitating extraneous disciplines. We shall treat literary works not as historico-cultural documents, not as philosophical or moral systems, nor even as practical counsel on how to live, but as *artistic objects*, as independent, imaginative worlds, created by means of specific and unique devices.

The following are some of the presuppositions and implications of the integral method:

(1) We are concerned with works and not with their authors. We are accustomed to identify authors with their works, to treat works as memoirs of their souls; but this is just one of the invasions made by psychology into literary study. Psychology was driven from the field

of logic by Husserl; it must be expelled from literary study, especially in that form (suitably called "psychologism") which considers objective properties as being states of mind of psychic subjects. Literary works, and in general works of art, are by no means purely psychic phenomena—they are at least psychophysical phenomena, or, more exactly, artifacts, i.e., artistic objects possessing their own existence independent of their authors. "Psychologism" in literary scholarship leads to the conclusion that we must pass through the author's soul to the understanding of the work, through the work to the reconstruction of his soul. Such a procedure is excellently defined by Professor Cherniss: ". . . it is . . . a vicious circle to intuit the nature of the author's personality from his writings and then to interpret those writings in accordance with the 'inner necessity' of that intuited personality."[11]

Moreover, those "mental experiences" of which the work is apparently an image cease to exist at the very moment when the created work begins its independent existence. Therefore, that with which we enter into relation in a work is no longer the mental state of the author but something that we are inclined to consider as such a state on the basis of our own experiences. We have, it seems clear, no means by which to penetrate the *authentic* experiences of the author. Consequently, works cannot contain authentic material for the reconstruction of the author's soul any more than the author's unknown soul can be a key to the understanding of his works. Finally, we are concerned with works; and experiences become literary works only when they are dissociated from their authors.

In a crude form, the identification of author and work is practiced by literary historians who transfer facts of the writers' *private lives* to their works and, on the other hand, complete gaps in their biographies by selecting facts, events, and experiences from the works. The mental features, convictions, sentiments, and intentions of their characters are ascribed to the authors. Yet the choice of these characters is scarcely involuntary—not even the most ardent literary psychologist can suppose, for instance, that the erotic life of Madame Bovary was that of Flaubert.

It would, of course, be absurd to deny the immanence of the author in his work, and the integral method does not attempt to deny it. But we must make a strict distinction between the *private* and the *artistic* ego of an author. Even if we knew very exactly all the spiritual processes of an author's life, the advantage of this knowledge would be very small. Stendhal teaches us that all the elements of the artist's private

[11] Harold Cherniss, *The Biographical Fashion in Literary Criticism*, Univ. of California Publications in Classical Philology, vol. XII, no. 15 (Berkeley, 1943), p. 288.

ego lose their personal significance and become *material* for artistic creation, its tools, an integral element of the work itself. So all the personal experiences of an author cease to exist in their primary form, and are transformed into something else, when they appear in literature. T. S. Eliot has drawn an already famous parallel between catalysis in chemistry and the process of transforming human events and experiences into artistic elements.

The artistic personality reflected in the work is much more accessible to us than the private personality; for in dealing with it we are not applying psychology (based for the most part on hypotheses), but studying concrete, real elements of the literary work. These elements are the author's language, versification, structure, characterization, treatment of various problems, and the like. Such elements some call, with a slight overtone of disdain, "technique," in contrast to the "spirit" of the work. Yet surely technique is nothing else than the manifestation of the spirit and the only medium through which it can manifest itself.

In general, we must try to limit ourselves to those aspects of the artistic personality deducible from the works themselves, and not to go beyond them. Any reconstruction of the author's *Weltanschauung*, of his intellectual or moral attitude, is problematical and risky.

Literary historians interested chiefly in authors and not in works must realize that they are engaged in a kind of biographical psychology, not a form of literary investigation. Biography is an old and venerable and doubtless permanent discipline, but it must be handled by specialists using historical documents of the lives and activities of men; literary works are by no means such historical documents, and must, therefore, be excluded as material for scholarly biographies. Literary scholars may sometimes be compelled to use biographical facts for commenting on or explaining works, as they use other materials—for instance, sources of historical novels—but they must always bear in mind that it is not the material itself which is important but the way in which it is adapted and transformed.

(2) The integral method cannot be concerned with genetic problems. Even if we can state how a work came into existence, out of what and why—which is, as we know, rather problematical—we do not explain its essence. It is a superstition that a work of art grows in a sort of progressive development of a whole "imagined" in the initial conception. Delacroix has shown how many times works of art are born not from an integral conception but from details and fragments, originally independent. Paul Valéry asserts that the sense of a work is not identical with the first conception of the author;[12] we can add, nor with the second

[12] E. Souriau, "Die Hauptrichtungen der gegenwärtigen französischen Aesthetik," *Zeitschrift für Aesthetik* (1934), No. 1, pp. 61 and 78.

or third! Literary genetics is, at its best, a realm of hypotheses neither fruitful nor explicatory. But its greatest failing is its lack of concern with the work in its final form, the proper subject of our studies.

The psychological genesis ought to be distinguished from the *literary* genesis, i.e., the origin of motifs and devices not from the life of the author but from *literature*. When we take into account the literary tradition, the means and degree of using it or opposing it, the transformation of old devices or the creation of new ones, we remain within the work, comparing homogeneous phenomena, and can establish genetic influences.

(3) The integral method is sharply opposed to the treatment of literary works as historical and social documents, and therefore to any reconstruction from them of historical and social life. Even the most realistic or "naturalistic" novel is a work of art. The material must, of course, be taken from "life," but it becomes transformed in a writer's laboratory. It is, therefore, extremely dangerous to identify life created in a novel with the real life of a given epoch.[13] Against such a confusion of history and fiction Aristotle protested centuries ago. History deals with what has happened, is based on concrete, authentic details out of which a synthesis is attempted; literature is fiction, generalization, and vision.

Is a literary work really understandable only against the background of general social life? The background may sometimes, but not always, be helpful; but it is by no means absolutely necessary for enjoyment, study, and appreciation of the literary values of a work. Actually we know very little of the social environment out of which the oldest Egyptian, Persian, Hindu, and even Greek poems arose (as a matter of fact, historians use these poems as a basis for the reconstruction of a hypothetical social life). Nevertheless we cannot say that the poems are not comprehensible.[14] A "realistic" novel or drama may be, but is

[13] D. S. Mirsky writes: "... Only persons ignorant alike of the nature of imaginative literature and of that of historical evidence will attempt to use Russian fiction as an historical source, unless its evidence is corroborated by extra-literary sources, in which case it becomes superfluous." *A History of Russian Literature* (New York, 1927) pp. 219-220. Vladimir Nabokov states in a very interesting book on Gogol: "... it is as useless to look in *Dead Souls* for an authentic Russian background as it would be to try and form a conception of Denmark on the basis of that little affair in cloudy Elsinor," *Nikolai Gogol* (Norfolk, Conn., 1944), pp. 70-71.

[14] Professor Cherniss states that "in the case of ancient literature there is no adequate material to enable the student to gain even a fairly complete theoretical knowledge of the environment in which were produced most of the works with which he is concerned" (*op. cit.*, p. 284). As to social-history method in general he writes: "The poem or play becomes a single stage in a hypothetical historical development in which the author is only an accident or at most an agent of forces which transcend him and of which he is unconscious ... this kind of literary his-

not necessarily, closer to social life than some types of lyric poems or fantasies. Ordinarily the knowledge of the historical background of a novel concerning a given epoch does not contribute in a decisive way to our understanding of it. There may be only the question of comprehending some of the "realia," i.e., details concerning daily life, houses, dresses, furniture, and habits now foreign to us. These, however, are only details without serious importance for our perception of a work.

(4) The problem of the relation of literature to social history involves another and broader one, that of the interrelation between literature and empirical reality. It is a habit, not only among common readers but among literary historians and critics as well, to confront these two realms, to measure and judge one by the other. Something in a literary work is said to be true or untrue "to life." We can legitimately ask: To whose life? To that of the readers and critics? Who among us can pretend that his knowledge of life is deep and large enough to embrace all other lives? Who can say that what seems to *him* "untrue" is not true to hundreds or thousands of other human beings? If our personal limited experience and knowledge of life were the criterion of literary truth and value, then most of the masterpieces of the more or less remote past beyond our experience, or even knowledge, would be today only soulless monuments. We have no means of discovering whether or not Homer's imaginative world was "true to life." But we are, in fact, equally helpless in attempting to verify the experiences of a hero of the most modern psychological novel, although we are better aquainted with the modern soul than with the historical world of the ancient Greeks. By our own experiences, we are incapable of judging whether all the "streams of consciousness," all the psychological processes presented in old and modern fiction, are "true to life" or not, whether they really happened in life in the form presented by the authors. And, after all, what sense and value would literature have, should it give us only that which we know well ourselves, what we have experienced ourselves and can at any moment verify from our own lives?

The criterion by which artistic truth is to be judged is therefore not "life," but artistic *motivation* and artistic *verisimilitude*. We believe what the author says to be true because of the evocative force of his writing, because the vision created by him takes hold of our mind so that we do not confront it with reality, but are inclined to credit the author's witness, to suppose that everything happened just as he saw and described it.

---

tory is not concerned with the understanding and appreciation of any single literary production as such but with relationships and connections which come to be taken for literature itself, whereas they are external to the essence of any particular piece of literature whatsoever" (*ibid.*, pp. 285-286).

Our false notion of reality also influences our attitude towards literary periods and movements. Classicism, sentimentalism, romanticism, realism, and naturalism are conceived and judged according to their degree of closeness to life. But these literary schools do not differ from each other because one depicts reality better than the other, but because each of them uses different means in creating imaginative reality. In principle, every literary work is a fiction, be it the most "artificial" idyll, the wildest romantic poem, or the most "realistic" novel. But their character and kind are determined by the different devices they employ: classic, romantic, realistic, and others. Every literary work, even the most fantastic or abstract poem, reflects *some reality,* even though that reality is to be known only by supposition. It follows that to understand romantic reality and to explain it we must confront it, not with the vague idea of life, but with another reality, equally fictitious or poetic, e.g., that of classicism or realism. In the same way we must confront realism with its predecessors or successors. It is not enough to say that realism is distinguished by such properties as common, average, trivial characters and events, "true to life people," daily known and met. More essential is the realistic technique: motivation based on "normal" causality, detailed, minute characterization, predilection for "concrete" details and for environment and its interrelation with characters, chronological composition of events, clearness in structure, simplicity in style. We have only to compare a novel by Voltaire or George Sand with a novel by Flaubert or Maupassant from this point of view to see clearly the essential difference.

(5) The integral method considers literary works as organic *unities* in which all constituent elements perform their specific, although not always equal, function. Since there is unity, there is no place for a dualism of what is called content and form. No "content" and "form" exist, in the popular meaning, as entities separate and different. There exists only a whole, expressed by various elements. The division of literary works into *what* and *how* is artificial and pointless because *what* is simultaneously *how* and the reverse; without *what* there exists no *how,* without *how* there exists no *what.* Not even the most ingenious summary is able to give a remote idea of the "content" of a work. Asked by a lady to tell her the contents of *Anna Karenina,* Tolstoy answered that, in order to fulfill her wish, he would have to copy out the whole novel.[15]

[15] This dualism of content and form was acknowledged long ago to be untenable; and today its opponents are becoming more numerous all the time. For Herder, thought and its expression are as inseparable as body and soul; for Lipps, content and form are a unity; for Croce, the aesthetic process lies in form and is form. Croce does not understand at all the distinction between content and form; Dessoir likewise opposes it; Kainz acknowledges only *Gestalt-*

Sometimes "content" is confused with theme, "idea," plot, etc. These elements, although they too in principle do not exist beyond their "form," are more easily treated separately. "Ideas" can be presented in abstractions which have little to do with the essential content of the work. If we say, for instance, that the idea of the *Divine Comedy* is the presentation of a faithful yet sinning soul which goes through Hell and Purgatory and aims at Heaven—or that Goethe in *Faust* wanted to show that life for one's own pleasure is insufficient, that one must have higher ideals and serve humanity—then we but reproduce in vulgarized simplicity the statements of a number of treatises devoted to the "philosophy" of these works. "Ideas" of literary works considered abstractly, deprived of all that gives them their artistic life, are empty, soulless, and often trivial schemes. "Ideas" in literary works lack the independent existence and character they possess in life, philosophy, and politics. They are strictly intermingled with other elements of the *whole* and must, therefore, be understood and explained in their literary *function*. (And function means: What is an ideological element in the work? What does it do? What is its action? To what extent and in what way does it organize the work? What is its structural role? What is its interrelation with other elements? Is it tied to them organically or could it be removed without harm? This is the way in which ideological problems should be treated, *if* they exist in literary works.) An "idea" must not be conceived of as a philosophical system; for, as part of a literary work, it is *unique* and cannot exist outside of the work. It is ridiculous to enter into polemics with poets and novelists, to lecture them on what is right and what wrong in the "philosophy" of their heroes, in a word, to treat ideological problems *in merito* and not *in arte*.

Closely related, there is another misunderstanding—the evaluation of literary works according to the importance of the problems they raise. If this application of extraliterary—and in addition very subjective—criteria were carried out consistently, it would lead to incredible confusion. Works of some types of ideology, like *Faust* or the *Divine Comedy*, would be placed above the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Klopstock with his *Messiah* would be more "important" than Shakespeare; Derzhavin, greater than Pushkin; Stendhal and Flaubert, far below *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. The simple truth is that abstract problems by themselves

aesthetik, quoting its creators in Germany (Mach, Ehrenfels, Meinong, Höfler, Witasek)—content and form are inseparable correlates. Some aestheticians still hold to the distinction between material (not content) and form (Croce, Lipps, Souriau, Zhirmunsky), but the Russian formalists, Eichenbaum and Tynyanov, have shown that the notion of material does not go beyond the limits of form. Lempicki states that none of these elements can be a separate subject of investigation.

do not matter at all, that there is no such hierarchy of problems in literature as there is in life, that problems do not confer importance upon works, but vice versa, works confer importance upon problems. A high artistic level means *eo ipso* a deep problem. The life of Christ becomes in the hands of Klopstock a bore, the life of a stupid clerk in Gogol's *Overcoat* an important question. Furthermore, the criterion of "progress" cannot be applied to literature as it can to science; this is especially true in regard to works of different "material." Shakespeare does not represent "progress" in relation to Dante, nor Goethe in relation to Shakespeare.[16]

(6) The fundamental and essential character of our scholarly investigation should be the *description* of literary works or of their constituent elements. We take the term "description" in the sense defined by the phenomenologists, that is, as a method of cognition of the *essence* of objects, in which are centered all the properties of a given phenomenon, distinguishing it and separating it from all other phenomena. In such a description the principal role is played by intuition (in the etymological sense of the word: *into-ire*); and one of the most efficient means of cognition is analysis.[17]

The problem of evaluation is one of the most difficult and delicate. Description is explanation and not aesthetic evaluation. Evaluation is not the most important or even sole aim of criticism; yet, practically, it seems to be an inevitable part of our field. We must, however, realize what the notion of value in respect to literary works means. All outstanding theoricians of value—Scheler, Rickert, Münsterberg, Stern —agree that aesthetic values are by their nature values of *objects* (*Sachen*), and differ by this from other values. That which makes our "object" a work of art is undoubtedly its aesthetic value. The evaluation, therefore, of a literary work can be done only on the basis of this criterion. Moral judgments are especially inadequate in view of the fact —as Croce put it—that art is *irresponsible*. There are no themes unworthy of art (excluding speculators trying to satisfy the depraved taste of the readers). Themes cannot be praised or blamed but only their *expression*. The morality of the writer is his consciousness of duty toward art.[18]

(7) There is, finally, the problem of division and limits of our field. We divide it into three main branches: (a) poetics or literary theory; (b) literary investigation *sensu stricto*; (c) theory of literary research,

[16] See Croce, *Aesthetik als Wissenschaft des Ausdrucks*, tr. K. Federn (Leipzig, 1905), pp. 129-130.

[17] Werner Ziegenfuss, *Die phänomenologische Aesthetik* (Leipzig, 1932), pp. 43-44.

[18] *Bréviaire d'Esthétique* (Paris, 1923), pp. 91, 171-174.

or methodology. Poetics is a general discipline studying literature as art.[19] Its importance for every serious work in our field cannot be overemphasized. Nobody can efficiently "practice" scholarly investigation without realizing *what* he is doing and in what material he is working —without defining such notions as art, literature, literary work, tragic, comic, humor, narrative, description, dialogue, structure, style, verse, and so on.

Since such a conception of our work is broader than what is called literary history, the whole discipline should be defined rather as literary scholarship (*Literaturwissenschaft*). Literary history is but one part of it. Moreover, literary history appears today loaded with so many traditional burdens, so close to history and so far from the integral literary method, that the conception of it urgently needs revision. Obviously we cannot accept literary history in the sense of history *de omni re scibili, et quibusdam aliis*. Like every other mode of literary research, literary history must be concerned primarily with literary works. It has to treat them, however, from the historical point of view, i.e., in evolution or, better, *in change*. Explanation of literary origins, of interrelations, affinities, and differences, of the evolution of literary genres and devices of structure, style, verse, etc.—these, in general, constitute the proper field of literary history. Extraliterary material, such as the history of politico-social movements or biographical and psychological aspects, must be excluded on principle, unless they are to be treated as "materials" of literary works. Such a historical approach can be applied both to the oldest and to the newest literary works and directions. By the same principle, the artificial and nonsensical division into "old" and "modern" literature vanishes, the former being the realm of literary history, the latter left to literary criticism.

My remarks may be considered an attack on everything hitherto done in literary scholarship, a revolutionary attempt to overthrow the old, venerable literary history without paying due tribute to its accomplishments—an act of base ingratitude. Such is by no means my intention. There neither has been nor is at present any revolution. The reaction against the old methods has been proceeding gradually since the beginning of the century. And the "integral method" is being built on many attainments both old and new. What it tries to do is to systematize them, to bind together particular theories and postulates, and to draw from them all the important consequences. (That it should attack many other aspects of the work of its predecessors is quite natural and characteristic of the development of every science.)

[19] Viktor Zhirmunsky, *Wstęp do poetyki* (Introduction to Poetics), Polish translation (Warsaw, 1934), p. 9.

"The worst gratitude toward a teacher is to remain forever only his pupil"—says Nietzsche in *Zarathustra*. We should be bad pupils if we were to do nothing but imitate the works of our masters. Many of them would perhaps understand us better than some of their ardent but blind disciples. Our gratitude toward our great predecessors cannot be better expressed than by continuing their work according to the new requirements of *scholarship*. I stress the word "scholarship" because our method has to do with disinterested investigation. Popular literary studies whether for young people or for wider circles of readers, may, perhaps must, sometimes use biographical and other bait. Even in such studies, however, it is plainly our duty to apply literary criteria to the treatment of literary works.

By way of conclusion, some essential points must be stressed. No method, our own included, can protect us from blunders. Method is only a tool, the efficiency and precision of which depend upon the user. We are not to worship method in itself. We do not consider the integral method an accomplished, unchangeable system; on the contrary, we are well aware of all its weaknesses and how much remains to be done in order to attain relatively satisfactory results. Nor do we deny the possibility of other approaches to literature, so long as their extra-literary character is clearly stated. But we are firm in our belief that there must be, and that there is, a purely literary approach.

Columbia University

CHAUCER'S USE OF LYRIC AS AN ORNAMENT OF STYLE

ARTHUR K. MOORE

THE SONGS and lyrics imbedded in most of the longer poems of Chaucer unquestionably represent conscious employment of an ornament of style, which, if not explicitly sanctioned by formal rhetoric, had none the less ample warrant in the popular misconception of *poetica* as decoration and dilatation.[1] This invidious justification derogates not at all against the English poet, who, in contrast to his French masters, Machaut and Froissart, usually achieved artistic fusion of lyric with frame. For poets less concerned with the logical organization of the whole composition than with artifices of amplification, interpolated lyric, like apostrophe[2] and description, had a special value in prolonging a thin book. As a consequence of their preoccupation with dilatation, mediaeval writers often failed to take into account the danger to orderly narrative progression inherent in these interludes. In the hands of a competent poet, of course, the artifice had a heightening effect; but the studied interpolations of *Troilus and Criseyde* are, in Middle English at least, altogether exceptional. It is not surprising that this ornament was generally abused quite as flagrantly as the formal *colores rhetorici*, upon which excessive stress was laid by the standard handbooks,[3] such as the *Ars Versificatoria* of Matthieu de Vendôme and the *Poetria Nova* of Geoffroi de Vinsauf.[4] For lyrical ornament is on any account a difficult device, since it must have for maximum effectiveness not only independent excellence but also dramatic significance; unless completely assimilated, interpolated lyric actually does narrative a disservice. If Chaucer's interpolations are in the main superbly functional, as this study will endeavor to show, the reason is that the English poet properly

[1] C. S. Baldwin, *Medieval Rhetoric and Poetic* (New York, 1928), pp. 187-196, discussing the confusion of rhetoric with poetic, comments upon the large dependence placed upon the "colours" during the later Middle Ages.

[2] Edmond Faral, *Les Arts poétiques du XII^e et du XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1924), pp. 70 f., observes that by apostrophe the mediaeval rhetoricians meant any address to person or object, whether, by the reckoning of the ancients, actually apostrophe or merely *exclamatio*.

[3] For example, more than half of the *Poetria Nova* is occupied with the ornaments of style.

[4] These treaties have been edited by Faral, *op. cit.*, pp. 106 ff.

conceived of "colours" as means to increased artistry, not as verbal embroidery.

Only a cursory inspection of the tradition is attempted in this article. A complete history of interpolated lyric (taking into account not only the mediaeval ramifications in Latin and the vernaculars but also the songs in Renaissance plays and modern novels) would be matter for a book and a large one. The tradition is here considered mainly with reference to Chaucer. Certain related literary practices of the Middle Ages and after are examined briefly for the purpose of differentiation.

Lyrical ornament is similar to, but by form and origin quite distinct from, the ancient *satura*, "that peculiar blend of prose and verse which the Romans claimed as their chief literary invention."[5] Although some of the metrical passages of the *Satyricon*[6] of Petronius Arbiter, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*[7] of Boethius, and the *Antapodosis*[8] of Liudprand, a tenth-century deacon of Pavia, have a faint lyrical quality, decoration is scarcely a major consideration. In truth, the vernacular counterpart of the *satura*, as Reinhard has observed,[9] is the *chantefable, Aucassin et Nicolette*,[10] even if the metrical sections of this late thirteenth-century romance were designed for singing.

The songs and lyrics dispersed through the English mysteries afford a second parallel, but the resemblance presumes no actual connection of two traditions. Normally Latin sequences and antiphons,[11] the songs are usually indicated only by brief directions, such as "sic ascendit, cantantibus angelis 'Ascendo ad patrem meum' " from the Towneley *Ascension*;[12] for copyists labored under no compulsion to provide text or notation[13] of pieces familiar to all. If the songs are sometimes purely ornamental, they are nevertheless native, and acknowledge therefore no debt to mediaeval rhetoric. As Collins has remarked, "when drama

[5] F. A. Wright (trans.), *The Works of Liudprand of Cremona* (London, 1930), pp. 17 f.

[6] Michael Heseltine (trans.), *The Satyricon* (Loeb Classical Library, London and New York, 1930).

[7] H. F. Stewart and E. K. Rand (trans.), *The Theological Tractates* (Loeb Classical Library, London and New York, 1918).

[8] Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 ff.

[9] J. R. Reinhard, "The Literary Background of the *Chantefable*," *Spec.*, I (1926), 160, where he points out several Latin antecedents of *Aucassin et Nicolette* and traces the tradition ultimately to Menippus of Gadara (third century B.C.). In Italy, where *prosimetrum* flourished, Dante's *Vita Nuova* stands as the prime exemplar (*ibid.*, p. 167).

[10] Mario Roques (ed.), *Aucassin et Nicolette*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1936).

[11] Fletcher Collins, Jr., "Music in the Craft Cycles," *PMLA*, XLVII (1932), 617. Collins puts the number of these songs in the Chester, Hegge, Towneley, York, and Coventry groups at ninety-five (*ibid.*, p. 616).

[12] George England (ed.), *The Towneley Plays* (EETSES, LXXI, London, 1897), p. 361.

[13] But see L. T. Smith (ed.), *York Plays* (Oxford, 1885) pp. 517 ff., and the cautionary note of Collins, *loc. cit.*, p. 618.

came out of the liturgy the melodies came along with the words."[14] Besides the Latin songs, there are numerous passages of indisputable lyric quality, consisting in the main of "laments and monologues, and . . . the hail verses addressed chiefly to Mary and the Christ child."[15] Drawn from the Scriptures, liturgy, and homiletical treatises,[16] these passages are usually elegiacal, monitory, or penitential, and strongly reminiscent of the religious lyric[17] contained abundantly in the Harley, Vernon, and later manuscripts.[18] Whether the songs and lyrics in general are dramatically appropriate[19] is not a problem for extensive consideration here. Many seem to have no special pertinence of any kind, while others serve mainly to effect transition, a function too frequently assigned to interpolated lyric in early Renaissance drama. For instance, three vernacular songs bridge awkward dramatic pauses in the Coventry *Pageant of the Shearmen and Taylors*.[20] "As I out rode this enderes night," possibly a religious adaptation of a *pastourelle*, covers the movement of the shepherds from the countryside, where they have heard the angels sing "Gloria in excelsis," to the presence of the infant Jesus. The second song, following the interview with Mary, has no relevance but gets the shepherds off the stage; and the third, a lullaby sung by the women bringing their children to Herod, fills the interval between the flight of Mary and Joseph and the slaughter of the infants. In this connection, J. R. Moore has written, "As the drama became secularized, the liturgical element was lost, and the songs became things of sheer entertainment."[21] Toward the end of the sixteenth century, however, dramatists became increasingly aware of the artistic possibilities of the convention, and finally Shakespeare achieved a consummate blending of song with dramatic frame.[22] The mingling of song with drama may be traced clearly back to the moralities and interludes, and, beyond this embryo drama, in all probability to liturgical origins. Consequently,

---

[14] Collins, *loc. cit.*, p. 613.

[15] L. E. Pearson, "Isolable Lyrics of the Mystery Plays," *ELH*, III (1936), 228 f.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 251.

[17] See G. C. Taylor, "The English 'Planctus Mariae,'" *MP*, IV (1906-07), 635; "The Relation of the English Corpus Christi Play to the Middle English Religious Lyric," *MP*, V (1907-08), 15 f.

[18] See Carleton Brown (ed.), *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century* (Oxford, 1932), *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century* (Oxford, 1924), *Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century* (Oxford, 1939).

[19] Collins, *loc. cit.*, p. 621, argues that the songs are entirely fitting.

[20] Hardin Craig (ed.), *Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays* (EETSES, LXXXVII, London, 1902), pp. 31-32. Though printed at the end of the play, these songs were sung after lines 277, 331, and 829.

[21] J. R. Moore, "The Songs of the Public Theaters in the Time of Shakespeare," *JEGP*, XXVIII (1929), 166. See also, by the same author, "The Tradition of Angelic Singing in English Drama," *JEGP*, XXII (1923), 96.

[22] Richmond Noble, *Shakespeare's Use of Song* (Oxford, 1923), p. 12.

there seems to be no reason for closely associating the tradition of interpolated song known to Chaucer with that known to Shakespeare, although the artifice was employed by both to secure similar effects.

In all likelihood, knowledge of this device came to Chaucer directly from Machaut and Froissart, who had drawn upon a tradition abundantly exemplified in French verse narrative of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The earliest monument provided with lyrical ornament is the *Roman de la Rose*, or—to distinguish it from the celebrated allegory—*Guillaume de Dole*, written between 1199 and 1201[23] by a religious now known to have been Jehan Renart.[24] This notable *roman d'aventure* contains forty-eight snatches of *chansons de geste, chansons de toile, caroles*, and courtly lyrics. A considerable number of the last group have been recognized as the work of prominent *trouvères* and troubadours. That the author intended to articulate the *chansons* intimately with the narrative is demonstrated by their effectiveness;[25] that he intended the songs as ornaments[26] is apparent from his comparison of them to a dye which renders cloth worthy of "los et pris":

> Car aussi com l'en met la graine
> Es dras por avoir los et pris,
> Einsi a il chans et sons mis
> En cestui romans de la Rose,
> Qui est une novele chose,
> Et s'est des autres si divers
> Et brodez par lieus de biaus vers,
> Que vilains nel porroit savoir.
> (Lines 8-15)

From the exceptional variety of lyrical matter incorporated with the romance, it is obvious that Jehan Renart commanded a large repertoire of courtly and popular songs, of which the latter, though ultimately of humble origin, were by 1200 known only to the aristocracy.[27] The narrative was not warped to accommodate the songs but the songs selected to fit the frame. For example, the Emperor Conrad, enamored of the "bele Lienor," sings at propitious moments stanzas of graceful *chansons* composed by the Châtelain de Couci, Gace Brulé, and Renaud de Beaujeu;[28] polished and decorous, these lyrics express precisely the chivalric

[23] Between 1210 and 1214, according to U. T. Holmes, Jr., *A History of Old French Literature* (New York, 1937), p. 270.

[24] This identification, suggested by Gaston Paris, "Le Cycle de la Gageure," *Rom.*, XXXII (1903), 487, was subsequently confirmed. See Karl Voretzsch, *Introduction to the Study of Old French Literature*, trans. F. M. Du Mont (New York, 1931), p. 355.

[25] See Paris' essay, *Le Roman de la Rose ou de Guillaume de Dole*, ed. G. Servois (SATF, Paris, 1893), p. lxxxix.

[26] See Faral, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

[27] See Paris' essay, *op. cit.*, pp. xcix f.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. cii.

ideals of the aristocratic society represented in the *roman*. In contrast, two maidens accompanying the citizenry of Mayence home from the traditional festivities of the eve of May first (that is, *Walpurgisnacht*) sing not a courtly lyric but a wonderful *carole* mirroring ancient folk custom:

> Tout la gieus sor rive mer,
> Compaignon, or dou chanter.
> Dames i ont bauz levez:
> Mout en ai le cuer gai.
> Compaignon, or dou chanter
> En l'onor de mai.
> (Lines 4154-59)

Jehan hoped that the lyrics would render the *roman* so pleasurable that no one would ever be bored by it—"Ja nuls n'iert de l'oïr lassez."[29] Though not for this reason, the long poem became important, first as the earliest of a series of verse narratives employing interpolated lyric, and second as an invaluable repository of mediaeval song.

In contrast to the skillful blending of song and narrative in *Guillaume de Dole*, several Middle English romances are interlarded with lyrics which the authors have made no attempt to integrate with the frames.[30] Nearly all of the twenty-six sections of the fourteenth-century *Kyng Alisaunder* are headed by brief lyrical passages, which are sometimes charming and almost invariably irrelevant. About half of these are of the *reverdie* sort, of which the opening of Chapter XI, Part II is representative:

> In tyme of May, the nyghtyngale
> In wode, makith miry gale;
> So doth the foules grete and smale,
> Some on hulle, som on dale.[31]
> (Lines 2547-50)

A similar passage inserted in the *Sowdone of Babylone* (*ca.* 1400) turns didactic after the usual observation on the season.[32] Perhaps the only lyric of literary consequence preserved in Middle English romances is the prelude to the second part of *Richard Coer de Lyon*, which possibly goes back to the beginning of the fourteenth century. This delightful appreciation of the springtime has, however, no special appropriateness, but is, like the other intercalations of the romances, merely decorative:

---

[29] Line 18.

[30] See J. E. Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English (1050-1400)* (New Haven, 1926), p. 490.

[31] Henry Weber (ed.), *Metrical Romances of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Centuries* (Edinburgh, 1810), I, 108.

[32] Emil Hausknecht (ed.), *The Romaunce of the Sowdone of Babylone* (EETSES, XXXVIII, London, 1881), pp. 28-29. Cf. *Arthour and Merlin*, ed. J. W. Hales and F. J. Furnivall, *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript* (London, 1868), I, 475.

Merye is, in the tyme off May,
Whenne foulis synge in her lay;
Floures on appyl trees, and perye;
Smale foules synge merye.
Ladyes strowe here boures
With rede roses, and lylye flowres.
Gret joye is in frith and lake;
Best and byrd playes with his make;
The damyseles lede daunse;
Knyghtes play with scheeld and launse;
In joustes and turnementes...[33]
(Lines 3731-41)

The scarcity of this device in the romances is not readily explained. True, the French works with lyrical ornament were not translated or adapted in England; but, as early as the reign of Edward I, Pierre de Langtoft had provided a widely known model in his Norman-French verse chronicle. There was, moreover, no lack of native lyric for the purpose, if the evidence of this same work has any value, for many of its intercalations were popular English songs.[34]

The tradition flourished throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in France. With *Guillaume de Dole* as a model, Gerbert de Montreuil between 1227 and 1229 composed the *Roman de la Violette*, following closely not only the plot of the older *roman* but also the stylistic innovation of interpolated lyric.[35] By comparison with the *chansons* of Jehan Renart's poem, which are usually of a proper length to intensify narrative segments without at the same time creating actual digressions, the songs of the *Violette* are often too brief—one- and two-line snatches. This *roman* nevertheless perpetuated the artifice, which before the end of the century came to decorate numerous long poems. Adènes li Rois, *roi de menestrels* at the Flemish court of Gui de Dampierre, inserted lyrics by other hands in the romance Cléomadès.[36] The author of the *Châtelaine de St. Gilles* used refrains from popular and courtly songs as the conclusions of stanzas.[37] Lyrical ornament appears also in *Meliacin* of Girart d'Amiens, the *Châtelain de Couci* of Jakemon Sakesep or Jacques Bretiaus, the *Tournois de Chauvenci*, the *Lai d'Aristote* of Henri d'Andeli, the *Roman de la Poire* of an otherwise unidentified Thibaut, and the *Renart le Nouvel* of Jacquemart Gielée.[38]

[33] Weber, *op. cit.*, II, 149-150.

[34] See Thomas Wright (ed.), *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft* (Rolls Series, XLVII, London, 1866-68), II, 162-383 *passim*.

[35] D. L. Buffum (ed.), *Le Roman de la Violette ou de Gerart de Nevers* (SATF, Paris, 1928), pp. xl, lxxxiii. The editor observes that, in the manner of employing the forty *chansons*, Gerbert followed *Guillaume de Dole* more closely than any of the subsequent imitators.

[36] Holmes, *op. cit.*, pp. 262-277.

[37] Voretzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 422.

[38] For additional examples, see Buffum, *op. cit.*, p. lxxxiii.

To this tradition belongs also *Le Jeu de Robin et Marion*,[39] a "musical comedy or a pastoral play"[40] composed by Adam de la Halle toward the end of the thirteenth century. A wonderfully contrived expansion of the *pastourelle*, this dramatic representation is interlarded with songs much as the English mysteries.

In the fourteenth century the convention continued to flourish, appearing in *La Dame a la Lycorne*, the *Prise Amoureuse* of Jehan Aicart de Hesdin,[41] the *Roman de Fauvel* of Gervais du Bus, and, most important for the study of Chaucer, in the *Voir-Dit* and *Remede de Fortune* of Guillaume de Machaut and in nearly all of the allegories of Jehan Froissart. From these last the English poet almost certainly learned to use lyric as a "colour"; his first long poem, the *Book of the Duchess* (*ca.* 1369), draws upon Machaut's *Remede* and Froissart's *Paradys d'Amours*,[42] both of which are liberally supplied with lyrics of the fixed forms. It is therefore probable that the two brief songs of the *Book of the Duchess* reflect the immediate influence of the French poets.

To a far greater extent than Machaut, Froissart misused the artifice, as his exceedingly prolix *Méliador* demonstrates. Composed about 1365, this romance was revised by the author some fifteen years later to accommodate seventy-nine ballades, roundels, and virelays of Wenceslas of Bohemia, Duke of Luxembourg and Brabant.[43] Although such flagrant abuse as this is not obvious in the allegories, the lyric is generally poorly integrated with the rest of the work. For example, the historian's first work, the *Paradys d'Amours*[44] is interrupted at line 75 by a complaint which, if fairly appropriate, proves a distraction before it ends at line 203. The allegorical figures, Plaisance and Esperance, demand a roundel of the poet at line 851, and he responds with the banal "Puisque Plaisance l'acorde." At line 888 Plaisance requests another roundel for no sufficient reason. Introduced by this same abstraction to the "dieu d'Amours," the poet tediously reveals not only his present distress but also his record of service to Amour and his lady in a *lai* beginning at line 1079 and continuing to line 1354. The virelay at line 1423 and the ballade at line 1627 are poorly motivated. However, the latter, "Sus toutes flours tient on la rose à belle," is an isolated segment of undeniable charm, in fact a lyric not unworthy of comparison with the *chan-*

[39] Ernest Langlois (ed.), *Le Jeu de Robin et Marion* (Paris, 1924), p. viii, observes that this play anticipates *opéra comique*.

[40] So described by Voretzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 461.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 479.

[42] The influence of Machaut and Froissart on Chaucer is a matter of extensive record. See F. N. Robinson (ed.), *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston and New York, 1933), p. 315; and, for specific relationships of the French poems to the *Book of the Duchess*, pp. 882-886 *passim*.

[43] Auguste Longnon (ed.), *Méliador* (SATF, Paris, 1895-99) I, li f.

[44] Auguste Scheler (ed.), *Œuvres de Froissart: Poésies* (Brussels, 1870-72), I, 1 ff.

sons d'amour of the early *trouvères*. The semi-autobiographical *Espinette Amoureuse*,[45] containing valuable recollections of childhood and a vague account of a protracted passage with an unidentified beauty, is interspersed with fourteen lyrics—ballades, rondeaux, virelays, and a *lai*, mainly designed by the poet to convince the lady of his devotion or to express his dejection. But the interpolations of the *Espinette Amoureuse*, like those of the *Paradys*, the *Prison Amoureuse*,[46] and the *Joli Buisson de Jonece*,[47] if occasionally fitting, are in the main scarcely more organic than the catalogues with which mediaeval poets dilated their narratives.[48] If a rambling, disjointed narrative style readily absorbed the shock of digression, the more precise structures of Chaucer resisted it; obviously, the English poet had to exercise strict control over a convention which the French poet could use with considerable freedom.

Perhaps for the reason that he was a superior poet, Machaut employed lyric somewhat more judiciously than Froissart, investing only the *Remede de Fortune* extensively with the ornament. In the *Voir-Dit*, that remarkable account of the "correspondance poétiquement amoureuse" between the aging canon of Rheims and his eighteen-year-old admirer, Peronnelle d'Unchair of Armentières,[49] the ballades and other fixed forms, as well as the prose letters exchanged by the noted poet-musician and his friend, are intercalated chronologically in the verse account of the affair, and serve therefore no ulterior purpose. On the other hand, the intercalations of the *Remede de Fortune*[50] (*ca.* 1342) were designedly ornamental. Moreover, Machaut took some pains to achieve close integration of the lyrics with the allegorical exhibition. Thus, in a passage beginning at line 401, the poet gives timidity as his reason for committing his sentiments to

> ... chansons et lais,
> Balades, rondiaus, virelais
> Et chans.

Fearing a refusal, Machaut cannot bring himself otherwise to reveal to his lady the "maus d'amours" which afflicts him. If the first lyric, a *lai* (lines 431-680), is too long, it has none the less an intimate relationship to the thin narrative—this somewhat abstract declaration of devotion falls into the hands of the one whom the poet loves, and she forces him to read it in her presence. Although the *lai* is completely functional,

[45] *Ibid.*, I, 87 ff.
[46] *Ibid.*, I, 211 ff.
[47] *Ibid.*, II, 1 ff.
[48] The re-evaluation of Froissart by B. J. Whiting, "Froissart as Poet," *Mediaeval Studies*, VIII (1946), 189-216, suggests that criticism of the historiographer's verse has been unnecessarily severe.
[49] Paulin Paris (ed.), *Le Livre du Voir-Dit* (Paris, 1875), pp. v-vi.
[50] Ernest Hoepffner (ed.), *Œuvres de Guillaume de Machaut* (SATF, Paris, 1908-21), II, 1 ff. The lyrics of the *Remede*, possibly composed especially for the poem, were also set to music. See II, 1-23 (appendix).

the six lyrics scattered through the remainder of the poem are far from indispensable. The tedious *complainte* (lines 905-1480) on love and fortune, following the *lai*, is patently digressive. Furthermore, the *chanson royal* (lines 1985-2032) and ballade (lines 2857-92) of instruction and encouragement sung to the poet by the feminine abstraction, Espérance, unnecessarily prolong the scene. On the other hand, the joyous ballade (lines 3013-36) uttered by the poet following the departure of Espérance effectively mirrors his altered mood. The last two lyrics are a virelay (lines 3451-97) and a rondelet (lines 4107-14) addressed fairly appropriately to the lady by the poet. Nevertheless, the connections are by no means so efficacious that it is impertinent to ask if Machaut were as much concerned with relevance as with representation of the major lyric types of the period—*lai, complainte, chanson royal* (virelay), ballade, and rondelet. At any rate, Hoepffner suspects that the poet, motivated by a design less artistic than didactic, actually intended these specimens as models of the fixed forms.[51] This supposition gains some credit from the fact that Machaut commanded uncommon respect in the fourteenth century. But whatever the purpose, the seven lyrics incorporated into the *Remede* are in no case utterly inorganic.

Machaut and Froissart then continued into the fourteenth century the tradition initiated by Jehan Renart, eventually passing it on to Christine de Pisan[52] and Chaucer. Into the frames of the *Book of the Duchess*, the *Parliament of Fowls*, the *Legend of Good Women*, the *Canterbury Tales*, and *Troilus and Criseyde*, the English poet inserted songs and lyrics which may be justified in most instances on dramatic grounds. Conventionally enough, his lovers utter self-revealing laments in solitude, or burst into passionate exclamations of devotion in the presence of ladies; but in the main the situations are not unnatural. Possibly there is not a single lyric which suggests that the poet valued the intercalation higher than the narrative environment. The two brief songs of the *Book of the Duchess*, if not indispensable, are welded neatly into place. Nevertheless, the first "compleynte"[53] delivered by the melancholy Black Knight is partially redundant, inasmuch as the source of his despondency is promptly and fully disclosed:

> I have of sorwe so gret won
> That joye gete I never non,
> Now that I see my lady bryght,
> Which I have loved with al my myght,
> Is fro me ded and ys agoon.

---

[51] *Ibid.*, II, xxxv.

[52] See the *Dit de la Rose*, *Dit de la Pastoure*, and *Livre du Duc des Vrais Amans*, ed. Maurice Roy, *Œuvres Poétiques de Christine de Pisan* (SATF, 1886-96). II, 29 ff., 223 ff., III, 59 ff.

[53] For other private laments see *Guillaume de Dole*, lines 922-29; *Espinette Amoureuse*, lines 1469-93; *Remede de Fortune*, lines 3013-36.

Allas, deth, what ayleth the,
That thou noldest have taken me,
Whan thou toke my lady swete,
That was so fair, so fresh, so fre,
So good, that men may wel se
Of all goodnesse she had no mete![54]
(Lines 475-86)

It is not known certainly whether Chaucer composed this lyric; but the sentiment, if commonplace, well becomes the knight, who sitting alone mourns his dead lady with real feeling. Yet it may be wondered why the complaint was not cast in couplets, for, with two other exceptions, the intercalations are indistinguishable metrically from the frames. The second song, described by the knight as the first, presumably of a series, which he made for his lady, is merely illustrative:

Lord, hyt maketh myn herte lyght,
Whan I thenke on that swete wyght
That is so semely on to see;
And wisshe to God hit myghte so bee
That she wolde holde me for hir knyght,
My lady, that is so fair and bryght!
(Lines 1175-80)

The sprightly roundel, "Now welcome, somer, with thy sonne softe,"[55] placed near the end of the *Parliament of Fowls*, serves not only as a concluding flourish but also as a means of cementing the relationship between the fabulous parliament and St. Valentine's Day, events which were not originally connected.[56] True, the pretext offered by the poet that birds customarily sang a roundel in honor of Nature before departing from the mating festival is a bit thin, since the lyric honors St. Valentine rather than Nature. On the other hand, the song, connecting the *Parliament* directly to the occasion for which it was written, gives the allegory a relevance not otherwise easily obtained. If the lyric, as well as the music, "imaked was in Fraunce,"[57] Chaucer also may have been interested in translating the song to the narrative on account of its value as pure ornament, possibly recalling the roundel placed near the end of Machaut's *Fonteinne Amoureuse*,[58] a work completed in 1361.[59]

One other dream allegory has a lyric of some interest. The ballade included with slight variations in both prologues to the *Legend of Good Women*—"Hyd, Absalon, thy gilte tresses clere"[60]—may have been sug-

[54] Here as elsewhere the references to Chaucer are from the Cambridge edition of F. N. Robinson.
[55] *PF.*, lines 680-92.
[56] *Encyl. Brit.*, 11th ed., s. v. "Valentine."
[57] *PF.*, line 677.
[58] *Œuvres*, ed. Hoepffner, III, 243. Cf. Froissart's *Cour de May*, ed. Scheler, *Œuvres*, III, 10.
[59] Hoepffner, III, xxx.
[60] *LGW.*, Prol. F, lines 249-69; G, lines 203-23. See Robinson, p. 957.

gested by Froissart's lovely marguerite poem, "Sus toutes flours tient on la rose à belle," in the *Paradys d'Amours*. The amplification of each is accomplished by the same rhetorical device. Froissart draws a contrast between the marguerite and other flowers, Chaucer between Alceste and other notable personages. The ballade is managed much more effectively in Prologue G than in F, a circumstance which lends strength to the position of those scholars who insist upon the priority of the latter.[61] If G was indeed the revision, then Chaucer confesses to a growing awareness of the dramatic possibilities of lyrical ornament. In F the awe-stricken poet breaks into a recitation of the ballade upon sight of the lovely lady accompanying the god of Love, but in G the nineteen ladies, joined in dance ("as it were in carole-wyse"), sing the ballade in honor of Alceste, who stands in the center of the ring. Whether the ballade was actually suited to this use matters little, for the sense of the lyric—the pre-eminence of Alceste—agrees with the creditable ritualistic dance. This skillful joiner's work is not surprising, because by the late 1380s, when the *Legend* presumably was commenced, Chaucer had perfected his art.

Troilus and Criseyde affords the most striking proof of Chaucer's recognition of the artistic possibilities of lyrical ornament; for interpolated lyric in this poem plays an extensive and dramatically significant part, enabling the poet to delineate with uncommon clarity and intensity certain salient stages in the development of a complex relationship. The translation[62] of Sonnet 88 of Petrarch's *In Vita*[63] inserted in the prolonged reverie of Book I is a concrete representation of the growing passion which has set the spirit of Troilus aglow. This lyric, which analyzes love as a malady, dwelling on its paradoxical character—"quike deth," "swete harm"—measures at the outset the Trojan's desperation. If the fervor of Petrarch's sonnet seems out of keeping with the facts of the situation, it must be remembered that by mediaeval reckoning the "dart of love" flew swiftly. Indeed, nearly a hundred lines earlier Chaucer had made this point clear by observing that Love from the "subtile stremes of hir [Criseyde's] yen" loosed his shaft as Troilus gazed upon the handsome widow.[64] The song then anticipates and heightens the love sickness into which the son of Priam shortly falls. Even the puzzling reference to Lollius which precedes the piece does not vitiate the suggestion of consuming passion implicit in the transplanted sonnet.

Antigone's "Troian song"[65] operates perhaps even more decisively

[61] See Robinson, p. 957.
[62] *TC.*, I, lines 400-20.
[63] Robinson, p. 927.
[64] *TC.*, I, lines 302-7.
[65] *TC.*, II, lines 827-75.

at another critical juncture. Drawn from Machaut's *Paradis d'Amour*,[66] this lyric asserts the integrity of the god of Love and praises the ennobling effects of the passion at a moment when Criseyde is wavering in her determination to maintain the posture of a circumspect widow. This intercalation, undeniably persuasive, dismisses the crabbed defamers of love, and represents it as a condition of continuing bliss. The widow's crafty question

> Lord, is ther swich blisse among
> Thise lovers . . . ?[67]

clearly indicates that her rationalization of the motives which prompt agreement to a clandestine relationship has been substantially accelerated by the song. From this moment, Criseyde's acceptance of Troilus' suit is predictable, the extended negotiations notwithstanding. Comment upon the skillful management of this scene in Book II is unnecessary; it is quite enough to point out that Antigone's song enables Chaucer to disclose the subtle alteration by dramatic representation rather than by less effective direct statement.

For Book III, Chaucer ignored a long prayer to Venus which Boccaccio had Troilo deliver[68] and used instead a fairly lyrical dissertation on love[69] adapted from Boethius.[70] Although this piece expresses the warrior's profound desire for a continuation of the blessed union and at the same time a growing sense of apprehension, the Boethian love which binds all creatures is rather more abstract than the variety cultivated by Troilus and Criseyde. There is, however, no lack of fervor in the *aube*-like apostrophes uttered by the lovers at the dawn of the day following consummation. If less natural than Juliet's poignant exclamation, they are wholly consistent with the style of the *Troilus*, and effective enough in measuring the intensity of their passion. In the first, Criseyde rebukes the Night for going;[71] in the second, Troilus declaims against the Day for coming.[72] Responsibility for these lyrical interludes is Chaucer's; the *Filostrato* provides no parallels.

The long lament constructed by Boccaccio for the mourning Troilo[73] Chaucer doubtless found digressive, and therefore substituted in Book V a lyric which by virtue of brevity and concreteness gives a sharp edge to the sense of tragedy rapidly enveloping the poem. The dramatic significance of this expanded nautical metaphor can scarcely be exagger-

---

[66] See Robinson, p. 932.
[67] *TC.*, II, lines 885-86.
[68] N. E. Griffin and A. B. Myrick (trans.), *The Filostrato of Giovanni Boccaccio* (Philadelphia and London, 1929), pp. 273 ff.
[69] *TC.*, III, lines 1744-71.
[70] Robinson, p. 939.
[71] *TC.*, III, lines 1422-42.
[72] *TC.*, III, lines 1450-63. Cf. III, lines 1702-08.
[73] Griffin and Myrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 401 ff.

ated, since it not only plumbs the depth of Troilus' despair but also foreshadows his death:

> O sterre, of which I lost have al the light,
> With herte soor wel oughte I to biwaille,
> That evere derk in torment, nyght by nyght,
> Toward my deth with wynd in steere I saille;
> For which the tenthe nyght, if that I faille
> The gydyng of thi bemes bright an houre,
> My ship and me Caribdis wol devoure.
> (V, lines 638-44)

Finally, among the isolable lyrics of the *Troilus* the letters exchanged by the lovers in Book V deserve attention.[74] The appropriateness of these admits of no question, since by no other means could Chaucer have shown as well the subtle changes worked by separation in Troilus and Criseyde—his mounting desperation, her waning affection. The contrast is painful. His letter in fifteen stanzas expresses abiding love mingled with deep anxiety; hers, in a meager six stanzas, all too plainly discloses cruel indifference and transparent dissembling. These epistles afford further illustration of the advantage of dramatic over expository representation, an advantage which Chaucer exploited to the fullest extent in the *Troilus*. Moreover, the interpolations are so successfully articulated with the framework that the decorative character of the lyrics scarcely appears.

The brief intercalations of the *Canterbury Tales* achieve in large measure the effect of the more extensively quoted lyric, without at all interrupting the flow of the narrative. If the songs represented by one, two, or three lines were known to the fourteenth-century audience, as seems likely, then the short quotation served to evoke substantially the same response as the complete piece. The fragment of a roundel inserted in the *Knight's Tale* goes just far enough to heighten the spirit of gaiety which possesses Arcite as he rides forth "to doon his observaunce to May":

> May, with alle thy floures and thy grene,
> Welcome be thou, faire, fresshe May,
> In hope that I som grene gete may.
> (A, lines 1510-12)

Similarly, the two lines of a love song incorporated in the *Miller's Tale*,

> Now, deere lady, if thy wille be,
> I praye yow that ye wole rewe on me,
> (A, lines 3361-62)

fill out the portrait of the hapless Absolon serenading the carpenter's wife in the bright moonlight. Dramatically no more is required, since the

[74] *TC.*, V, lines 1317-1421, 1590-1631.

character of the song may be inferred readily. Nevertheless, Chaucer might have quoted more liberally but for one other circumstance—that popular song appropriate to the churlish musicians of the company was generally not decasyllabic. A verse from the Pardoner's song—"Com hider, love, to me!"[76]—illustrates the difficulty. It is not supposed that Chaucer simply concocted this and other snatches for the occasion. Substantial evidence to the contrary was provided by Skeat, who discovered six additional verses to the song mentioned by the first line in the *Nun's Priest's Tale*—"My lief is faren in londe!"[76] The truth seems to be that the poet was reluctant to vary the metrical arrangement of the poem to accommodate an intercalation. Only the first song of the *Book of the Duchess*, the roundel of the *Parliament of Fowls*, and the ballade of the *Legend of Good Women* deviate from the established pattern; and the departure in these instances is limited to rhyme. Even the Petrarchan sonnet of *Troilus and Criseyde* is adjusted to rime royal.

The scarcity of interpolated lyric in the *Canterbury Tales* may also be explained in part by the fact that Chaucer came, after a time, to reject much French convention, developing a direct and vigorous narrative style[77] which eschewed obtrusive ornament. Rhetorical "colours" he continued to use, though, as Manly remarked,[78] with a growing sense of dramatic appropriateness. Yet the poet's virtual abandonment of lyric as ornament during the Canterbury period implies no inefficaciousness; the splendid blending of song and frame in *Troilus and Criseyde* demonstrates the contrary.

In view of the strong influence exerted by the *Troilus* in the fifteenth century, it is surprising that interpolated lyric was employed rather infrequently. Only Lydgate seems to have made extensive use of the artifice, and he obviously failed to understand its dramatic uses. To the individual tragedies of the *Fall of Princes* (*ca.* 1438),[79] the monk regularly appended envoys of a more or less lyrical character. Thirty-one of these are regarded as ballades by Miss Cohen,[80] though numerous others fit the loose conception of the genre held in England during the period. Far from integral, each piece reiterates the moral inculcated by the preceding sketch, as if it could be easily missed. In the *Temple of Glas*, Lydgate inserted a "song" designed to honor Venus,[81] who had

[78] *CT.*, A, line 672.

[76] *CT.*, B^2, line 2879. See W. W. Skeat, "Chanticleer's Song," *Athenaeum*, Oct. 24, 1896, p. 566.

[77] See Baldwin, *op. cit.*, pp. 280 ff.

[78] J. M. Manly, "Chaucer and the Rhetoricians," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XII (1926), 110.

[79] Henry Bergen (ed.), *Fall of Princes*, EETSES, CXXI (London, 1924); CXXII (1924); CXXIII (1924); CXXIV, (1927).

[80] H. L. Cohen, *The Ballade* (New York, 1915), pp. 256 f.

[81] J. Schick (ed.), *Lydgate's Temple of Glas* (EETSES, LX, London, 1891), pp. 55-56.

just finished a long address to the lovers. This intercalation, actually a true ballade except for slight variations in the refrain, is not inappropriate, although it is difficult to speak of artistry in a poem which gives little evidence of it. A prayer to the Virgin inserted at line 16947 of the *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*[82] is essentially fitting. The ballade as envoy occurs in three other works by Lydgate: the *Floure of Curtesye*,[83] *Seynt Margarete*,[84] and the prose narrative, *Serpent of Division*,[85] of which not one is noteworthy.

Besides Lydgate's interpolations, the fifteenth century affords little evidence of a convention which, through Chaucer's poetry in the courtly love tradition, was well known. The Chaucerian *Ile of Ladies*[86] and the *Court of Sapience*[87] have ballade envoys, which are of course not organic. On the other hand, interpolated fairly skillfully in the *Parliament of Love* is a lyric mistakenly labeled "balad" by the author.[88] Sung by a company of women, like the ballade of the *Legend of Good Women*, it supplicates the god of Love to bless the parliament. The poem ends with three stanzas of rime royal called a "little song."[89]

Elsewhere in the work of the period, lyrical introductions, interpolated hymns and prayers, and envoys invite attention, although it may be wondered if the versifiers who burdened their poetry with these excrescences had a fundamental understanding of lyrical ornament. Like the nature descriptions of the English romances and the lyrics of the mysteries, which are usually not accompanied by formal introductions designed to define their relationships to the frames, these fifteenth-century examples are little more than elaborate scrollwork. Chaucer alone in mediaeval England definitely understood the proper use of the lyric as an ornament of style, and like Shakespeare, who worked with a separate tradition, ultimately refined an artifice more often abused than artistically employed.

University of Kentucky

---

[82] F. J. Furnivall (ed.), *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*, Pt. II (EETSES, LXXXIII, London, 1901), 454f.

[83] H. N. MacCracken (ed.), *The Minor Poems*, Pt. II (EETS, CXCII, London, 1934), pp. 417-418.

[84] Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

[85] *Ibid.*, p. 256.

[86] Alexander Chalmers (ed.), *The Works of the English Poets, from Chaucer to Cowper* (London, 1810), I, 394.

[87] Cohen, *op. cit.*, pp. 280 f.

[88] F. J. Furnivall (ed.), *Political, Religious, and Love Poems*, rev. ed. (EETS, XV, London, 1903), pp. 76 f.

[89] *Ibid.*, pp. 78 f.

POUND, LAFORGUE, AND DRAMATIC STRUCTURE

WARREN RAMSEY

"I WAS a man in a hurry," Ezra Pound remarked in 1948. "When I got to London in 1908 I was an extremely unsophisticated individual. Eliot was born with all that, Laforgue and so on. I had to acquire it." Pound thereby demonstrates once more a capacity for self-examination that has enabled him to move restlessly from stage to stage of artistic development. He gives evidence of a certain absence of vanity

> But to have done instead of not doing
> this is not vanity . . .

that must always have gone along with his superb rôle as the principal animator of Anglo-American poetry in the twentieth century. And he puts us in mind of the fellow poet whose name cannot be left out of any discussion of the Laforguian influence.

The historical framework of Pound's relationship with Jules Laforgue is fairly familiar. Pound began to read the *Complaintes* and *L'Imitation de Notre-Dame la Lune* about 1915, having been introduced to them by the work of Eliot. In the preceding half-dozen years spent in London, in Italy, in the United States, Pound had published his first verse, in which the manner of the early William Butler Yeats is evident. *A Lume Spento, Personae, Exultations* are full of still forest pools and the very "Crepuscular Spirit in Modern Poetry" which Pound deplores in one of the poems. The following passage,

> By the still pool of Mar-nan-otha
> Have I found me a bride
> That was a dog-wood tree some syne.
> She hath called me from mine old ways,
> She hath hushed my rancour of council,
> Bidding me praise
> Naught but the wind that flutters in the leaves,

is hardly Pound as we think of him. Despite a poem in praise of Robert Browning, this passage represents the prevailing tone of *Personae*.

These lines do not show Pound as he wished to be thought of, even as early as 1912, three years after the publication of *Personae*, when *Ripostes* appeared, with the first mention of *les Imagistes* in the back. First and last, Pound valued the final letter on "Imagiste" and "Ima-

gisme"; it served to fix a great gulf between the movement as he conceived it and the avatar animated by Amy Lowell. In his pronouncements concerning the nature of the image, Pound did not limit valid poetic imagery to the visual. But T. E. Hulme, on whose aesthetic speculations Pound and his friends leaned so heavily, virtually makes this limitation; and so does the 1915 manifesto of the Imagist group, a document based in great part on Pound's oral criticisms and the principles deducible from his famous blue-pencillings of his fellow craftsmen's efforts. In practice, the Imagists were poets of objects clearly seen. Having learned Hulme's lesson concerning the poetic values of small, dry things, they ordinarily avoided the graceful picturesque. On the other hand, they were rarely able to suggest realities beneath appearances. Structurally speaking, the Imagist poem tends to be the elaboration of a single visual image, or else it places end to end a series of such images, in a compound but not a complex relation. The ambitious poets among the Imagists—Pound insofar as he was an Imagist—sensed limitations of method, straitness of viewpoint, within their program, and began to cast about for techniques which would permit them to respond to complex realities in a complex way. It was at about this point of creative dissatisfaction that Pound began to read Laforgue.

He saw in the work of the French poet primarily an intellectual element, which he called "logopoeia" and defined as "the dance of the intellect among words." Using the term first in 1918, he came to reserve it almost exclusively for discussion of Laforgue. "Unless I am right in discovering it in Propertius," he observes in *How to Read*, "we must almost say that Laforgue invented *logopoeia*, observing that there had been a limited range of logopoeia in all satire, and that Heine occasionally uses something like it . . . At any rate Laforgue found or refound logopoeia." Thus Pound instituted a critical term of some value, besides making a bolder and more accurate estimate of Laforgue's dynamic significance than anyone had made up to that time, in France or elsewhere. Laforgue, said Pound, was a finer artist than either Corbière or Rimbaud; not as vigorous a draughtsman as the former nor as firm a colorist as the latter, he was the most discriminating of the three and accordingly had the most to teach.

It has been generally agreed that Pound, most active of poet-pedagogues, contrived to instruct others concerning Laforgue, to transmit lessons of craftmanship inherent in the French poet's verse and particularly applicable to the American poetic mind. Beginning to write about Laforgue in 1917, in the London *Egoist* and in Harriet Monroe's *Poetry*, he loaded 1918 numbers of the *Little Review* with translation from Laforgue's verse, with a prose pastiche based on one of the tales, with seven of the poems reprinted in French along with extensive critical comment. The consequences of this presentation were considerable; Hart Crane,

Allen Tate, and an undetermined number of young American writers thereby made their first acquaintance with Laforgue. This French poet, said Pound, was an angel with whom the American poetic Jacob would have to wrestle. The evidence shows that those who wrestled were those who later found the strength to affirm themselves, less in Laforgue's way, these younger writers, than in their own.

A more contested point has been how much direct influence Laforgue exerted on Pound's own poetic practice. René Taupin in his *Influence du symbolisme français sur la poésie américaine* found little or none: "La poésie de Laforgue n'a pas laissé de traces importantes dans l'œuvre de Pound." The contrary could, I believe, be shown. One could begin by contrasting an earlier quatrain with two later ones. The first is taken from Pound's Imagist volume *Ripostes*, the poem with the good Imagist title "Apparuit," and is characteristic of that volume:

> Half the carven shoulder, the throat aflash with
> strands of light inwoven about it, loveli-
> est of all things, frail alabaster, ah me!
> swift in departing.

The second and third are chosen almost at random from *Hugh Selwyn Mauberley* (*ca.* 1920):

> "Siena mi fe'; Disfecemi
> Maremma"
>
> Among the pickled foetuses and bottled bones,
> Engaged in perfecting the catalogue,
> I found the last scion of the
> Senatorial families of Strasbourg, Monsieur Verog,

and, from the first poem of the group, with its title borrowed from Ronsard, "Ode pour l'élection de son sépulcre,"

> Unaffected by the "march of events,"
> He passed from man's memory in *l'an trentiesme*
> *De son eage*; the case presents
> No adjunct to the Muses' diadem.

The verse from the *Purgatorio* which Pound uses as a title leads forward, of course, to "The Fire Sermon" in *The Waste Land*: "Siena mi fe'; disfecemi Maremma" was to give

> Highbury bore me. Richmond and Kew
> Undid me . . .

Almost as certainly, however, these and other quatrains of *Mauberley* lead backward to the French poet whom Pound had been studying in the years since the publication of *Ripostes*. They represent a kind of intellectual discussion that can be pertinently described as "logopoeia." One of Laforgue's favorite images, that of the foetus, turns up. The

cliché, "march of events," is pressed into ironic service, according to characteristic Laforguian procedure. The verse depends on the literary reference as Laforgue's does, with "l'an trentiesme de mon eage" woven in. Here too are the long "international" words out of Latin, the sort of diction into which Laforgue withdrew on slight pretext. At the end of the third quatrain, "No adjunct to the Muses' diadem" furnishes the ironic sparkle of grandeur to which Laforgue was particularly addicted. Alone, no one of these traits would be enough to justify the term "Laforguian." Occurring all together, sustained by the ironically learned tone which was Laforgue's contribution to nineteenth-century verse, they send us back to the Pierrot poems.

No one, I think, would be more likely than Pound to maintain that the structure of the literary work of art begins with and comes round again to the quality of the separate word. If *le Verbe* is in a distinctive way the true agent in Laforgue's poetry, in Pound's, in Symbolist and Neo-Symbolist poetry generally, then full recognition of its agency must be made in any study whereby we seek to come to grips with the reality of poems. Nor is it irrelevant to recall that Mauberley's "true Penelope was Flaubert"—Mauberley's, Pound's, and several other North and South American poets'; these would recognize no difference in kind between the "musical phrases" of their own verse and the fragments from *Un Cœur simple* which Pound works into Canto VII. It would be worth while to dwell on the distance separating the falsely archaic, unduly simplified diction of *Personae* from the properly complex, ironic wording of Mauberley, bearing witness to activity on the intellectual level, eliciting more than one kind of response from the reader.

But wording does not make the poem, even though something that Pound calls "language" was the prime concern of the men of his group, though he would make a rough-and-ready distinction between these poets and later ones primarily concerned with "imagery." Symbolists in several places have reiterated the lesson of the eighth chapter of Aristotle's *Poetics;* the structural order of the incidents also counts, especially in the poem of epic or dramatic pretensions. Stefan George, whose poems are mostly brief, wrote that "the worth of a body of poetry is not to be determined on the basis of isolated beauties, however unmistakable, in lines, strophes, or longer passages . . . *die zusammenstellung,* the relation of separate parts to one another—these are the distinguishing marks of high poetry." Paul Valéry, some of whose poems are lengthy, remarked on the many beautiful lines written by bad poets. We must think of how a poem is or is not held together. Pound's reputation as a poet will in the long run depend not on any alleged accord between his poetic practice and his far-fetched poetic theories, but on whether he has ever achieved that interrelation of diverse parts in which the best

work of Symbolist poets resembles that of their European predecessors.

The larger problems of structural order would seem to arise with particular force when a poet who has first written verse suffused with Celtic twilight, then poems turning around a pointed intellectual remark, finally undertakes "a poem of some length," the *Cantos*. In the long work he is faced with the necessity of rising from image and remark to some kind of general design. The unsuccessful Cantos will be those in which Pound fails to rise from the particular to the general—those, I would say, in which he follows most faithfully his so-called "ideographic" or Chinese-picture-writing method of heaping disconnected particulars together. Granting that the cluttered Cantos are too numerous, it is none the less uncritical to speak, as is quite commonly done, of all the Cantos as equally scrappy, evenly graced with exquisite but gratuitous passages. There is a good deal of difference in quality between Canto and Canto. In some of them Pound achieves, luminously, I think, structural order, general design. These poems rather than *Mauberley*—incisive but somewhat thin on the whole—may well be counted Pound's most solid accomplishments. I should like to look at some of these Cantos, and the means by which order is attained, and then suggest that structurally as well as stylistically there may be common ground between Pound and Laforgue.

The place, in Canto IV, is a

> Palace in smoky light,

the time soon after the fall of Troy:

> Troy but a heap of smouldering boundary stones.

Ten lines further on:

> And by the curved, carved foot of the couch,
> claw-foot and lion head, an old man seated
> Speaking in the low drone . . . :
> Ityn!
> Et ter flebiliter, Ityn, Ityn!
> And she went toward the window and cast her down,
> "All the while, the while, swallows crying:
> Ityn!
> "It is Cabestan's heart in the dish."
> "It is Cabestan's heart in the dish?
> "No other taste shall change this."
> And she went toward the window,
> the slim white stone bar
> Making a double arch;
> Firm even fingers held to the firm pale stone;
> Swung for a moment,
> and the wind out of Rhodez
> Caught in the full of her sleeve.

The opening lines suggest the same passage from the sixth Metamorphosis of Ovid to which Eliot refers in "A Game of Chess":

> the change of Philomel, by the barbarous king
> So rudely forced.

King Tereus, having violated Philomela, the sister of his wife, Procne, has cut out the victim's tongue and left her imprisoned in a hut in the forest. Philomela weaves a web telling of the outrage and sends it to Procne, who makes her way to her sister during the rites of Bacchus and sets her free. Furious, the sisters kill Itys, Tereus' son by Procne, and serve him up to the king to eat. "Three times plaintively" the king cries out the name of his son, while the offended gods change Philomela into a swallow and Procne into a nightingale condemned to lament forever the death of Itys. (Both Ovid and Pound avoid the confusion of the later Roman mythographers, whereby the tongueless Philomela is made into the nightingale.)

> "All the while, the while, swallows crying:
> Ityn!

But at this point the action has already shifted. Pound believes in a "continuous present," believes that "all ages are contemporaneous." The subject of

> And she went toward the window and cast her down

is Soremonda, wife of the barbarous Lord Raimon de Castel Rossillon. Raimon, according to the three Provençal *vidas*, killed his wife's lover and gave her the baked heart to eat. After she had duly appreciated it, he said,

> "It is Cabestan's heart in the dish."

When Soremonda had recovered speech and sense she said, with the wonderful precision of the legend, "Seigner, ben m'avetz dat si bon manjar que ja mais non manjarai d'autre"—roughly, "No other taste shall change this." The Greek and the Provençal myths are really one—that of the loved object given to the lover to eat. With the help of his continuous present Pound has reduced two things to their essential unity and advanced that fusion of Greek and Provençal legend which is the principal intellectual design of Cantos I-VII. In a kind of poetry wherein literary reference is "of the process," as he would say, in which knowledge on the reader's part is essential to understanding, Pound has passed from the particular image to the ordering universal.

He immediately proceeds with a bilingual pun to another such combination:

> 'Tis. 'Tis.'Ytis!
> Actaeon . . .

The slightly altered bird cry introduces the figure of a mortal hunted by hounds, a figure that is at once Actaeon and Peire Vidal, the furrier's son and troubadour from Toloza who loved a lady named Loba de Puegnautier so well that he called himself "Lops," and worked a lupine figure into his coat of arms, and donning a thick wolfskin had himself hunted with dogs and mastiffs and greyhounds. If Achaia is Provence, it is not unreasonable to find "Troy in Auvergnat," where Cantos V and XXIII put it. Pound recalls that another troubadour, an obscure one, Peire de Maensac, stole away the wife of a certain Bernart de Tierci. The latter, identified with Menelaus, pursued the seducer northward, where he had taken refuge with the powerful Dauphin of Auvergne. The parallel breaks down at one point, however; the Dauphin protected the lovers successfully for the rest of their days, and this second Ilion did not fall. When Pound writes near the end of Canto XXIII

> . . . that was when Troy was down, all right,
> superbo Ilion . . .

before sending Aeneas off with Anchises, he can only mean the original Troy.

At several points in these early Cantos the poet suggests the major identification of Eleanor of Aquitaine with Helen of Troy. The convergence is clearest in II and VII. But it is nearly as definite in VI, and the reiterated epithets *helenaus, helandros, heleptolis*—"ship-, man- and city-destroying"—apply to the composite figure.

Canto VI begins:

> What you have done, Odysseus,
> We know what you have done . . .
> And that Guillaume sold out his ground rents . . .

Guillaume, seventh count of Poitiers, ninth duke of Aquitaine, "sold out his ground rents" in order to take part in the first crusade—to participate, that is, in war financed by mortgage or sale of real property, in war breeder of Usura and most of the rest of what Pound detests. Another crusader presented early in this Canto, Louis VII of France, Eleanor's first husband, dealt similarly with his possessions. Obviously Pound is looking to the Middle Ages for originals of the modern mortgaged warrior. Is he looking to antiquity as well? He was undoubtedly familiar with those accounts, summed up by Gilbert Murray, which would make of the Trojan War merely another commercial incursion, an attack on the rich citadel of the Hellespont by seafaring and perhaps homeless Greeks. Yet there is no escaping the catalogue of the ships in the second book of the *Iliad;* the leaders and their men were associated with specific localities. Certainly Odysseus, along with many other heroes, is represented as returning to a fixed abode. Pound may have imagined him setting out from one under circumstances not

radically different from those governing Guillaume of Aquitaine, Louis le Jeune, and all the feudal lords who sold or pledged their property and thereby gave modern capitalism one of its principal impulsions. If this were the case, we should have a better explanation than any other available for the strategic placing of a long translation from the *Odyssey* as the very first Canto. Canto I would relate to what is perhaps the main theme of all the Cantos, Usura.

These illustrations of what I consider to be Pound's characteristic method in the *Cantos* could be multiplied almost indefinitely. In V, for instance, his thoughts turn to the retributive murderer, to Lorenzino de' Medici's assassination of his cousin Duke Alessandro of Florence. The sixteenth-century murder reminds Pound of the slaying of Agamemnon by Clytemnestra, who, according to the motivation established by both Aeschylus and Sophocles, had as excuse Agamemnon's sacrifice of her daughter Iphigenia. Pound quotes in Greek from Agamemnon's terrible cry as he is struck twice in his bath. Lorenzino (or Lorenzaccio—Pound also uses, like the Florentine populace, the contemptuous diminutive) appears again in Canto VII and in XXV. There is a certain appropriateness in Pound's preoccupation with this character. For Lorenzaccio "pondered Brutus," as Pound tells us; or, rather, he pondered two Brutuses, the earlier one who brought about the exile of the proud Tarquins and the later one who put an end to Caesar. Lorenzaccio imagined that he was both Brutuses and one heroic tyrannicide; Lorenzaccio achieved in his mind, if not in the mediocre verse he composed, something like that bold fusion of figures in a telescoped time which characterizes Pound at his best.

The poetic progress of Jules Laforgue was much more like Pound's than has been appreciated. The French poet was also endowed with a plastic imagination of great vividness, was apt at rendering visual particulars. There are passages in his early verse and whole poems in the work of his middle period which could well stand as Imagist poems. In the course of his poetic development Laforgue was more and more moved to comment, to assimilate refractory materials; Dujardin and others among his contemporaries called it his "psychological" curiosity. The Pierrot poems, like *Mauberley*, are full of observations which give the effect of wrenching loose from conventional verse patterns accommodated to conventional subject matter. As his technique and reflective power advanced, Laforgue evolved a free verse founded on the autonomy of the rhythmic unit, longer or shorter, ordinarily set in a line by itself; the parallel with Pound's poetry based on the "musical phrase" is evident. The degree of controlled freedom attained in the *Derniers Vers* in 1890 was hardly less notable than that achieved in the Cantos in our time.

Certainly there is little similarity of tone between the early Cantos and

the *Derniers Vers*. Somewhat more Laforguian tonality can be detected in the *Pisan Cantos*, where the *Vae soli*, Laforgue's shuddering cry of loneliness, is echoed in the poems presenting the gorilla cage, the deal table, and the other emblems of Pound's captivity at Pisa:

> a man on whom the sun has gone down
> and the wind came as hamadryas under the sun-beat
> Vae soli
> are never alone
> amid the slaves learning slavery
> (LXXIV)

But tone, for a technician like Pound, is a secondary consideration. It seems to me, however, that between characteristic passages of the best Cantos—particularly of I, III, IV, VI, VII, and XLVII—and segments of Laforgue's work there is also significant resemblance in the manner of grouping, reducing, deriving generality from particularity and unity from diversity. Before Pound, Laforgue made anachronism methodical, the present continuous, and all ages contemporaneous. These calculated associations of figures and events are most plentiful in the prose tales, where Lohengrin and Endymion are dissolved into a single moonstruck image of masculine beauty, where Hamlet conceived as a nineteenth-century artist quotes Hobbes on the one hand and imagines himself sought out by a sister of Helen of Narbonne on the other, where a single evangelist is at once John the Baptist and a labor agitator, "bâtard de Jean-Jacques Rousseau." The *Moralités Légendaires* are in some ways Laforgue's most interesting work; they include the last writing he did, and his invention found freer play there than in most of the verse, where, very young poet as he was, he was condemned to redefinition of the romantic *Lui* and *Elle*. These compositions were seldom lacking in ingenuity. His ironic-romantic hero, "un Philippe de Compiègne Mais né pierrot," belongs to "l'école des cromlechs Et des tuyaux d'usine" and fishes in troubled water her who is at once "Eve, Joconde et Dalila." The romantic pair escape together toward an isle which is simultaneously Eden, the Pole, and Eldorado. In the *Derniers Vers* we find such a passage as this:

> C'est l'automne, l'automne, l'automne,
> Le grand vent et toute sa séquelle
> De représailles! Et de musique!...
> Rideaux tirés, clôture annuelle,
> Chute des feuilles, des Antigones, des Philomèles:
> Mon fossoyeur, *Alas poor Yorick!*
> Les remue à la pelle!...

Here the fall of leaves observed by Hamlet *is* the falling away of the Antigones, the Philomelas; the metaphors close gaps in time. Figures from three tragedies, one of them identified by quotation in quite a Poundian way, combine with the autumnal imagery, high wind, drawn

curtains, close of season, to yield one universal, the falling away of everything. The tragic figures here have in common only their mortality. But "Pan et la Syrinx" and "Persée et Andromède," the last-written of the prose tales, as well as the earlier ones, offer good reason to believe that Laforgue envisioned and would, time allowing, have employed on a larger scale a dramatic technique founded on the fluid change of personage into related personage. The monster in "Persée et Andromède" is not only almost all the dragons of antiquity, as the creature himself sums up his story at the end, but the Beast who is finally transformed by Beauty's liberating love. With great dexterity Laforgue ingrafts one "continuously present" legend upon another.

Two bodies of imaginative work, Pound's and Laforgue's, show a development from more or less haphazard allusiveness toward increasing correlation of allusions. In two bodies of verse, for the most part loosely woven, faithful to the inconclusiveness of the interior conversation, the same kind of knot is occasionally tied very tight. It has often been suggested that Eliot had from Pound the idea for the structure of *The Waste Land*, which is characterized by the convergence of literary relata in a telescoped time. One thinks of the middle section of that poem, "The Fire Sermon," of Tiresias, and of Eliot's note: "Tiresias, although a mere spectator and not indeed a 'character,' is yet the most important personage in the poem, uniting all the rest. Just as the one-eyed merchant, seller of currants, melts into the Phoenician Sailor, and the latter is not wholly distinct from Ferdinand Prince of Naples, so all the women are one woman and the two sexes meet in Tiresias."

Neither Pound in the *Cantos* nor Laforgue in the *Derniers Vers* presents a central figure of whom it could be said, as Eliot says of Tiresias, that what he "*sees* is, in fact, the poem." Pound lacks Eliot's sure instinct for strengthening one personage at the expense of others; and Laforgue elaborated by significant means a fairly conventional *Lui*. Yet the *Cantos* furnish many precedents for the one-eyed merchant, the Phoenician Sailor, the Prince of Naples; and Eleanor of Aquitaine, Tierci's wife, Soremonda, and a multitude of other female figures do tend—like Eve, la Gioconda, and Delilah—to compose one Helen. Who else besides Laforgue, within the area of Pound's intensive reading between 1915 and 1920, the years when the later manner of this highly assimilative poet was being formed, summoned myths from widely separated periods and places to find in them a common element and the beginnings of dramatic unity? Perhaps Ezra Pound, the "man in a hurry," had from Laforgue not only the ironic attitudes and ironic style for which the French poet is well known, but also an idea for the organization of allusive verse which he passed on to Eliot, the man from whom he had first learned of Laforgue.

University of California, Berkeley

CHINA AS A SYMBOL OF REACTION IN GERMANY, 1830-1880

ERNST ROSE

IN STUDYING Chinese-German literary relations, one meets comparatively few examples of direct influence or imitation.[1] Yet, in numerous German books written by nonspecialists, China is often mentioned or used as an illustration. While the real China has been little known and too distant, an image of China has been constantly available and has lived its own life little affected by advances in commercial and political relations or in scholarship.

During the early part of the eighteenth century[2] the German image of China was based on the interpretation of Confucius advanced by the French Jesuits in their many travel reports and scholarly publications. According to the Jesuits, Confucius was a deistic philosopher and statesman of unusual eminence; his ritualistic demands had no special religious significance and could therefore be followed without misgivings by the newly baptized Chinese Christians. This interpretation appealed to the rationalists, who could point to an admirably organized state founded upon enlightened philosophy alone. When Albrecht von Haller in his late novel *Alfred, König der Angelsachsen* (1773) wished to describe an ideal constitutional monarchy, he had a seafarer paint in glowing terms the faraway kingdom of China. Similar views were held by most of his German contemporaries.

It was Herder, the great opponent of enlightened rationalism, who destroyed this German image of China. Far from being an example that could be universally emulated, the Chinese state, according to Herder,

[1] The same has been said concerning Chinese-English literary relations. G. Currie Martin, *China in English Literature* (London, 1916), p. 22, refers to the "poorness rather than richness of its acquaintance with China." This, of course, does not take into account American literature, on which see Arthur Christy, *The Orient in American Transcendentalism* (New York, 1932), and William Robert North, *Chinese Themes in American Verse* (Philadelphia, 1937).

[2] See Eduard Horst von Tscharner, *China in der deutschen Dichtung bis zur Klassik* (Munich, 1939). See also Ursula Aurich, *China im Spiegel der deutschen Literatur des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1935); but see the highly criticals reviews by E. H. v. Tscharner, *Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung*, LVII (1936), 1882, and *Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung*, XXXIX (1936), 569-571, and by Ernst Rose, *Ger. Rev.*, XI (1937), 70-72. For further material see Donald F. Lach's excellent bibliographical article, "China and the Era of Enlightenment," *Journal of Modern History*, XIV (1942), 209-223.

was the definitely dated and localized product of the Eastern Mongolians. It was not a progressive institution, but a mere petrification of an ancient way of life. Herder likened China to a hibernating marmot and even an embalmed Egyptian mummy!

Herder's romantic followers[3] took over this new conception. For Friedrich Schlegel as well as for his philosophical friend, Windischmann, China was an example of a state built upon abstract logical principles without the benefit of the imagination. To to sure, some younger romanticists began to discover Chinese lyrics and Chinese fairy tales. But these discoveries failed to correct the contemporary idea of an entirely rigid, unimaginative China. The figure of Lao-tse, which was destined to play such an impressive role with twentieth-century readers, was known then only to a few specialists and hardly entered into the discussion. On the whole, the German romantic evaluation of China was negative in the same degree to which the rationalistic interpretation had been positive. The French evaluation in the first decades of the nineteenth century was even more negative.[4]

Nineteenth-century Sinology gradually broadened the factual basis of European conceptions of China and also changed certain basic misconceptions. Yet for a long time the romantic image of China held unquestioned sway over the minds of the German public. It was even accepted by the Hegelians and the writers of Young Germany who thought they had ushered in a more realistic attitude toward life. Though they made their own curious application of the romantic ideas, they did not basically change them.

Because this particular phase of Chinese-German literary relations has heretofore received but scant attention, the present article will describe it in detail, adding to what has been known[5] a few facts that have not received the attention they deserve.

---

[3] See my articles, "Die Romantik und China," *Geistige Arbeit*, V (1938), no. 1, pp. 5-6, and "China und die Spätromantik," *Mitteilungen der Akademie zur wissenschaftlichen Erforschung und zur Pflege des Deutschtums*, XV (1940), 236-249. See also Chuan Chen, *Die chinesische schöne Literatur im deutschen Schrifttum* (Kiel, 1933), reviewed by R. F. Merkel, *Sinica*, X (1935), 143-144. Of only partial significance is Elizabeth Selden, *China in German Poetry from 1773-1833* (Berkeley, 1942), reviewed by Ernst Rose, *Ger. Rev.*, XVIII (1943), 228-229.

[4] See William Leonard Schwartz, *The Imaginative Interpretation of the Far East in Modern French Literature, 1800-1925* (Paris, 1927), and Hung Cheng Fu, *Un Siècle d'influence chinoise sur la littérature française, 1815-1930* (Paris, 1934). Schwartz, p. 222, bluntly says that the French in the first decades of the nineteenth century "took almost no interest in China and Japan until the revelations of the first French sinologues excited the imagination of a few Romantic writers like Gautier, Hugo, and the young Flaubert, Du Camp and Bouilhet."

[5] For older treatments see Henri Cordier, *Bibliotheca Sinica*, 2nd ed., 5 vols. (Paris, 1904-24). More recent is the dissertation by Chuan Chen (see note 3). See also Mary Gertrude Mason, *Western Concepts of China and the Chinese, 1840-1876* (New York, 1939). For English and American literature see the works mentioned in note 1. For French literature see those mentioned in note 4.

China in the Philosophy of Hegel and his Disciples

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel himself subscribed on the whole to the romantic interpretation of China. Although he studied the subject extensively and tried to arrive at an independent view of the Celestial Kingdom, he had to rely mostly on French and English sources and did little more than repeat the preconceptions of the age.[6]

The description of China in his lecture course on the philosophy of world history,[7] which he gave first in 1822, is rather extensive; Hegel was undoubtedly happy to find available such a wealth of information on an Asiatic country. Like Herder, however, he paid little attention to the encomiums of rationalistic scholars and gave but little praise to Confucius. Yet, while Herder had tried to explain the mechanism of the Chinese state on an ethnological basis, Hegel attempted to explain it in historical terms. When Windischmann and Friedrich Schlegel had attempted such an interpretation, they had dwelt on China's exclusion from the Christian Gospel. Hegel, whose God was an abstract "idea," concluded that China had not realized the higher evolution of this idea achieved in the countries of the Occident. On history's road to absolute freedom China had missed the freedom of the individual. The Chinese state was an admirable patriarchy and a well-functioning bureaucracy, but it also represented an unbearable despotism. The basis of Chinese morals was the family, and not even the Chinese emperor was an independent individual; he had to follow religiously the old maxims of the empire. Other Chinese had just as few civil rights. They were equal before the law, but equal merely as slaves. Their families were not held together by voluntary love, but by rigid commandments. There was not the least consciousness of individual liberty in this backward nation of slaves. As a consequence, Hegel could not find any free spirit, inward religiosity, deep feeling, or high ethical standards in China. In their place, the dead hand of abstract reasoning had arrested all life by its withering touch. China had no share in history. "It has always remained what it was."

Similar views were expressed in Hegel's lectures on the philosophy of religion,[8] which he gave for the first time in 1824. As he had denied to

[6] See Mason, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-74. Hegel's sources were chiefly the Jesuit standard works of the eighteenth century, and nineteenth-century reports of British ambassadors.

[7] Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Weltgeschichte*, vollständig neue Ausgabe von Georg Lasson (*Sämtliche Werke*, VIII-IX, Leipzig, 1919), II: "Die orientalische Welt," pp. 275-342; Paul Barth, *Die Geschichtsphilosophie Hegels und der Hegelianer bis auf Marx und Hartmann*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1925); Georg Lasson, *Hegel als Geschichtsphilosoph* (Leipzig, 1920); Alberto Castellani, "Hegel e la Cina," *Il Marzocco*, Florence, Oct. 12, 1924, p. 3.

[8] Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion*, ed. Georg Lasson, *Sämtliche Werke*, XIII, Part II (Leipzig, 1927, chap. I ("Die Naturreligion"), pp. 105-119, 235; see also Lasson's introduction, p. viii.

the Chinese any free spirit, he also had to describe their religion as something entirely unspiritual. *Tien*, Heaven, was the highest principle of Chinese religion, and it was indeed an absolutely empty principle. The emperor ruled everything, including the visible and the invisible realms of nature. To be sure, Hegel had heard of Taoism, and he grudgingly admitted that its proponents had started to think independently. But the movement had led to no real independence; for its adherents, the emperor had merely been replaced by the priests. The Taoists followed a different ritual than the disciples of Confucius, but essentially they were just as uninspired. Instead of addressing themselves to God as free individuals, they accepted the whims of fate without questioning and only assumed childishly that they might avert them by magical operations. Superstitiously, they attributed powers to numerous external elements and interpreted them by weird prophecies. Chinese Buddhism was not extensively described by Hegel. He spoke of the religion or sect of Fo and was uncertain whether it was identical with Buddhism.

Hegel's first extensive treatment of Chinese philosophy can be found in his lectures on the history of philosophy[9] of the year 1825-26. He did not include Lao-tse in his lectures before the year 1827-28, although Abel Rémusat had started his Taoistic researches in 1816.[10] Naturally, Hegel did not have much to say in favor of his subject. Chinese philosophy appeared to him as a dry arrangement of abstract principles, and Confucius was little more than a representative of practical common sense.

On the whole, Hegel's image of China was little different from that of German romanticism. Yet it had a distinct political coloring and his accent on individuality was far removed from the conception of a harmonious universe which ruled German classicism as well as German romanticism. Thus the liberal movement of the 1830s and 1850s found Hegel to its liking and avidly embraced a philosophy that seemed to justify its longing for unrestricted individual freedom.

Hegel's views were soon taken over by his disciples and kindred spirits. The law historian Eduard Gans followed his master almost liter-

[9] Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie*, vollständig neu nach den Quellen herausgegeben von Johannes Hoffmeister, *Sämtliche Werke*, XVa (Leipzig, 1940). I have also consulted the old edition, *Werke*, XIII, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1840).

[10] He translated in 1816 *Le Livre des récompenses et des peines* and published in 1823 an "Extrait d'un mémoire sur Lao-Tseu, philosophe chinois du sixième siècle avant notre ère qui a professé les opinions attribuées à Platon at à Pythagore," *Journal Asiatique*, 1re Série, III (1823), 3-15; read in the French Academy on July 28, 1820. Lao-tse's chief work was first translated in 1842 by Stanislas Julien as *Lao Tseu Tao Te King, le livre de la voie et de la vertu*. On European knowledge of Lao-tse before Rémusat's and Julien's times, see E. H. v. Tscharner, "Das Schicksal Lau Dsis im Europa des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts," *Sinica*, VIII (1933), 232-238.

ally in 1824,[11] and the Swabian liberal Karl von Rotteck expressed similar views about the same time.[12] For him, China did not even belong to history, since it had remained stationary and had not made the least progress; Chinese history should be compared rather to the natural history of an animal species! Though Rotteck, the rational liberal, could not overlook the eminence of Confucius, yet he could argue that Confucius had not succeeded in changing the Chinese. China as a whole was a synonym for reaction. When, in April 1826, Rotteck completed his extensive *Allgemeine Geschichte,* he concluded with the following ominous warning to his European contemporaries:

> If the party which now has the ear of the princes should obtain a complete victory, Asia would be the mirror reflecting our future destiny. As formerly during the many centuries of the declining Eastern Roman Empire, noble and proud spirits then would have no more joy in life, no more reward for their efforts. Gradually our decline would lead us to the status of the Chinese, and the Russians would be our conquerors, just as the Mongolians or Manchus have conquered the Chinese. To be sure, freedom still will not withdraw from the world completely. But the holy fire which up to then was guarded by Europe, will be seen by us only in the distance, on the other shore of the Atlantic Ocean![13]

Rotteck's history (1812-27) soon became popular and continued its vogue even after the middle of the century. Undoubtedly it had a pronounced role in fixing the idea of a reactionary China in the minds of contemporaries.

There was little to counteract this idea. Other German historians' descriptions of China[14] were written in a similar vein, and German Sinologists[15] likewise spoke of the "sober dryness" of the Chinese spirit that was incapable of lively imagination. When they referred to Lao-tse,

---

[11] See Eduard Gans, *Das Erbrecht in weltgeschichtlicher Entwicklung* (Berlin, 1824), I, 98-99; see also his *Vermischte Schriften* (Berlin, 1834), II, 180.

[12] Karl von Rotteck, *Allgemeine Geschichte vom Anfang der historischen Kenntniss bis auf unsere Zeiten,* Erste amerikanische Originalausgabe (= 13th ed.), (New York, 1849), VI, 164; I, 206, 287, 207.

[13] Translated from the quotation in Wilhelm Roscher, "Zur Erinnerung an Friedrich List," *Nord und Süd,* III (1877), 48. The words in the 10th ed. of *Allgemeine Geschichte* (Freiburg i. Br., 1834, IX, 541-542) and in the first American edition (IX, 478) are about the same. For a similar prophecy see Ernst Moritz Arndt's *Geist der Zeit,* I (1805): "Injustice will give birth to new injustice, violence to new violence, disgrace to new disgrace, and the ruins of Europe will collapse under the Mongols" (translated from Arndt, *Werke,* ed. by A. Leffson and W. Steffens, Berlin, n.d., VI, 172).

[14] Friedrich Christoph Schlosser, *Universalhistorische Uebersicht der Geschichte der alten Welt und ihrer Kultur* (Frankfurt a. M., 1826), I. Theil, 1. Abtheilung, pp. 84, 96, 98.

[15] SeeJohann Eduard Erdmann, *Grundrisz der Geschichte der Philosophie,* 3rd ed. (Berlin, 1878), p. 11; Peter Federsen Stuhr, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Religionsformen der heidnischen Völker* (Berlin, 1836), I, 17, 21, 25, 33; see also his *Die chinesische Reichsreligion und die Systeme der indischen Philosophie in ihrem Verhältniss zu Offenbarungslehren mit Rücksicht auf die Ansichten von Windischmann, Schmitt und Ritter* (Berlin, 1835).

whose existence might have made them critical of such views, they haughtily described him as strange and absurd.

The learned Sinologists drew no political conclusions from their discussions as did all the true Hegelians—of whom Eduard Gans was our first example. Another example is Karl Rosenkranz[16] who, though personally averse to philosophical and political extremes, followed his master when discussing Chinese literature in his *Handbuch einer allgemeinen Geschichte der Poesie* (1832). He found that the Chinese state had exaggerated its original principle of fairness and justice in a one-sided way and had become a mere police state. Spontaneous family love had been replaced by cold respect and empty hypocrisy. While the oldest Chinese poetry still reflected a noble and simple family existence, contemporary China lived by the tyranny of the police.

This attitude is no longer romantic, but Young German—even the most remote facts acquire a political meaning. It is significant that the romantic philosopher Schelling himself in his old age was affected by this political trend. In his lectures on the philosophy of mythology, which he gave for the last time in 1845-46, he referred to "the prerogative of the state in China" and to "the oppressive power with which it has hindered all free development and has suppressed it for thousands of years."[17]

After 1848 the German political scene became calmer, and the judgments on the Chinese constitution became more balanced. Later Hegelians of course continued to hold derogatory views of China, and continued to allude to contemporary political conditions. But their criticism was less sharp than before the March days of 1848. Friedrich Theodor Vischer's *Aesthetik* of 1848 refrained from detailed discussion of the Chinese, whom he held to be human enough, although human in distortion.[18] (American and French authors and artists had not yet discovered the art and the poetry of the Far East.) Johann Eduard Erdmann in his Hegelian *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (1865)[19] likewise skipped over Chinese philosophy, which to him seemed to consist of mere rules of polite behavior not deserving the name of genuine philosophy.

Only one later Hegelian devoted considerable space to China—Moriz Carrière in his book on *Die Kunst im Zusammenhange der Kulturentwicklung und der Ideale der Menschheit* (1863-73).[20] For Carrière,

[16] Karl Rosenkranz, *Handbuch einer allgemeinen Geschichte der Poesie* (Halle, 1832), I, 5-21. His later views were milder; see his *Die Poesie und ihre Geschichte* (Königsberg, 1855), pp. 42 ff.

[17] Schelling, *Sämtliche Werke*, Zweite Abteilung, II (Stuttgart, 1857), 534.

[18] Friedrich Theodor Vischer, *Aesthetik oder Wissenschaft des Schönen*, II (Reutlingen and Leipzig, 1848), 229.

[19] See note 15 above.

[20] Moriz Carrière, *Gesammelte Werke* (Leipzig, 1886), IV, 173, 174, 178, 186.

who eschewed the slavish repetition of his master's verdicts, the Chinese were not simply arrested in their evolution, but were merely conservative. Although he, too, saw nothing new in the later periods of Chinese history, he still could admire the intelligent expression and application of the original principle. Yet when Carrière started to fill in this picture with colorful detail, he again came back to the formulas of Hegel's lectures. He found the true picture of China in the legend of Lao-tse, the child who was born with the white hair of an old man.

One of the last descriptions of China in the words of Hegel can be found in C. L. Michelet's *System der Philosophie als exacter Wissenschaft*, the fourth volume of which appeared in 1879.[21] He called China a land without development, the Eldorado of Conservatism, and contrasted the prosaic tales of the Chinese with the imaginative epics of the Hindus.

A similar view was held by Eduard von Hartmann in *Das religiöse Bewusstsein der Menschheit* (1882),[22] where he criticized Chinese religion for its lack of richness and depth. It did not develop a real moral consciousness and did not arrive at an intensive feeling of guilt and a need of salvation. Compared with the youthful religion of the Greeks, the Chinese religion displayed the Hippocratic face of a child that has congealed to senescence.

Liberal popularizers followed the lead of philosophers and scholars and made their views the common stock in trade of every drawing-room discussion. The "precious" literary historian Johannes Scherr[23] called China the "automaton of world history," and termed her heroes "police commissioners," her hero lore a "collection of administrative decrees." He denied the Chinese any genuine idea of God or feeling for the transcendental. They were for him merely prosaic rationalists. Perhaps, with the exceptions of Lao-tse and the *Shi-King*, no monument of Chinese literature could pass review with this arrogant Young Hegelian. He took no pains to describe Chinese works in detail.

Scherr did not stand alone among his contemporaries. Julius Leopold Klein in the third volume of his *Geschichte des Dramas*[24] gave considerable space to Chinese dramatic literature, but that did not mean that he took it seriously. In his opinion the Chinese drama represented the lowest stage of dramatic development. He ridiculed the Chinese as a

[21] C. L. Michelet, *Das System der Philosophie als exacter Wissenschaft enthaltend Logik, Naturphilosophie und Geistesphilosophie*, IV, 1 (Berlin, 1879), 147, 152, 164, 165; III (Berlin, 1878), 358, 432.

[22] Eduard von Hartmann, *Ausgewählte Werke*, V, 1, 3rd ed. (Bad Sachsa im Harz, 1906), 146, 148.

[23] Johannes Scherr, *Geschichte der Religion*, I, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1860), 196, 197, 202, 210, 212, 217, 219; *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur*, I, 6th ed. (Stuttgart, 1880), 18, 22; *Bildersaal der Weltliteratur*, I, 3rd ed. (Stuttgart, 1884-85), 13.

[24] J. L. Klein, *Geschichte des Dramas*, III (Leipzig, 1886), 375, 389, 497.

nation of three hundred million pigtails and six hundred million soles beaten by bamboo canes.

Klein was exploited by Rudolf von Gottschall in his study, *Das Theater und Drama der Chinesen* (1887).[25] Like Klein he regretted the oppressive bamboo cane, the force of which made the gigantic Chinese empire uniform and monotonous. In the Chinese drama Gottschall professed to see the same stiffness and mechanical perfection, the same petty details of emotion, and the same wealth of meaningless titles. Its idea was to serve the advantage of the state. The Chinese stage was "the only stage of the world, the aesthetic principles of which can be found in the code of criminal law."

Thus Hegel's views of China definitely determined the attitudes of his contemporaries and immediate successors. Still, in the course of years a certain criticism did not remain unheard. Karl Rosenkranz, who in 1832 had closely copied his master, in a lecture of 1866 undertook to correct him.[26] Undoubtedly the historic events following the outbreak of hostilities between England and China in 1840 had induced him to take a more realistic attitude towards China. While conceding the basic Chinese conservatism, Rosenkranz denied the view that China had completely remained outside the realm of history. Its pigtails were a late importation, and its present quiet condition was the result of wars extending over centuries. Rosenkranz was even independent enough to find in China such praiseworthy institutions as the right of choosing one's domicile ("Freizügigkeit"), freedom of trade ("Gewerbefreiheit"), freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and the absence of a privileged nobility. This must have sounded strange in the ears of a liberal audience inculcated with the idea of a Chinese police state.

While Rosenkranz was a conservative Hegelian, Arthur Schopenhauer's philosophy was conceived independently.[27] The few places where Schopenhauer spoke of China also showed an attitude that was at least different from the average. Whereas the true Hegelians had criticized the little influence of Chinese religion on Chinese life, he found that condition praiseworthy and compared Chinese civilization favorably, in this respect, with European civilization. He was therefore convinced that the Christian missionaries would make little headway in China, but for a different reason than Herder, who had held the same view. According to Schopenhauer, the Chinese would see in the Gospel an interesting story rather than a doctrine. Like Leibnitz, he could even find Chinese script reasonable despite its awkwardness, for it made possible a quick and direct communication between two nations which did

[25] Rudolf von Gottschall, *Das Theater und Drama der Chinesen* (Breslau. 1887), pp. 2, 13, 14, 17-19, 46, 67.

[26] Karl Rosenkranz, *Neue Studien*, I (Leipzig, 1875), 467, 468, 494.

[27] See Schopenhauer's *Sämtliche Werke in zwölf Bänden*, ed. Rudolf Steiner (Stuttgart, n.d.), XI, 79, 53-54, 252-253, 353.

not know each other's language. Elsewhere, however, Schopenhauer mentioned Chinese pedantry.

If one should try to analyze more precisely the political attitude of most of the Hegelian authors quoted thus far, one would not always find a clear division between democrats and liberals, i.e., between thinkers stressing the individual's participation in the state and thinkers stressing an individualism which demanded as little interference from the state as possible. While both would be naturally opposed to the rationalist view of China, they would not be moved by the same reasoning.

Friedrich Nietzsche must certainly not be classified as a democrat, and his aversion to China was therefore expressed in terms quite different from those we have met before. He saw in China a paramount example of statism, and statism was for him synonymous with democracy. So he painted China as a stagnant democracy that had progressed far in equality and antlike scholarship. This "Chineserei" smacked strongly of mediocrity, and the European socialists and worshippers of statism could here find a true image of the so-called happiness for which they were looking.[28]

When Nietzsche called Immanuel Kant "the great Chinese of Koenigsberg," he gave vent to his philosophic irrationalism, which existed side by side with his political liberalism. The same irrationalism was responsible for Nietzsche's praise of Lao-tse's antirealism, while Confucius seemed to him to be merely another priest of a sacred lie.[29] In the same passage of *Morgenröte* (1881)[30] in which he referred to the Chinese as industrious ants, he also held them capable of teaching restless Europe some Asiatic calmness, contemplation, and durability. On the whole, one gets the impression that Nietzsche did not completely identify China with rationalistic Confucianism and thus foreshadowed the more critical image of China that appeared at the beginning of the twentieth century.

China as a Literary Symbol of Reaction

By Herder China had been called an embalmed mummy, by Hegel a dumb automaton. In view of such associations it is not astonishing that China in the 1830s and 1840s easily became a literary symbol of tenacious conservatism and single-minded reaction. Since Hegel had explained China's condition by a lack of individual freedom, his picture appealed strongly to all liberal writers. By opposing China they could

[28] Nietzsche, *Werke*, Erste Abteilung, V (Leipzig, 1908), 335, 67; IV (Leipzig, 1909), 205.

[29] Nietzsche, *Werke*, Taschenausgabe (Leipzig, n.d.), 100-101; X, 399, 440; *Werke*, Erste Abteilung, VII (Leipzig, 1910), 160.

[30] Nietzsche, *Werke*, Erste Abteilung, IV (Leipzig, 1909), 205.

fight political reaction, and especially its most rampant form, the Prussian state. When some of Hegel's disciples described China as the most policed state in the world, they undoubtedly had Prussia in mind. This association now became a fixed metaphor in the writings of the authors of Young Germany.

Young Germany was a decided opponent of earlier romanticism and often seems like a rejuvenated rationalism. Rationalistic writers, such as Montesquieu and Voltaire in France, Goldsmith in England, Wolff and Haller in Germany, liked to criticize European conditions by contrast to conditions in the Orient. Now China became a metaphor for Europe. The reason is again partly practical. Just as eighteenth-century writers had to fear despotic princes, so nineteenth-century writers had to avoid tyrannical censors.

The Young Germans were journalists and tried to serve everyday politics; they no longer propounded general philosophical ideas in the manner of Schiller or Novalis. Yet they were not always as practical-minded as they believed themselves to be. They were still romantic enough to delight in the costumes they were forced to adopt. Another of the Young German characteristics was a predilection for mummery, especially exotic mummery. Without doubt this predilection added weight to the practical necessity for using the Chinese costume. Without their often delightful metaphors, many writings of Young Germany would appear like dusty political pamphlets of abstract Hegelian antecedents.

As a metaphor for reaction, China had been available since Herder's time. The popular playwright Kotzebue[31] once compared German and Chinese conditions and described China as the more reactionary country. But it remained for Heinrich Heine, the great forerunner and model of the Young Germans, to use the Chinese metaphor as a political weapon. While he was a student he described two Chinese exhibited in Berlin as disguised Austrian stooges sent by Metternich to corrupt the Prussian constitution.[32] In his *Harzreise* (1826) he ridiculed Chinese cemeteries, and in the *Memoiren des Herren von Schnabelewopski* (1834) referred to China and Upper Bavaria as countries of equal stupidity.[33]

But Heine was not always a politician and a journalist. He also had his romantic moments, when he took a primary delight in the Chinese costume. A letter to Moser[34] asserted: "There are only three educated civilized nations: the French, the Chinese, and the Persians. I am proud to be a Persian." Even clearer was his romantic delight in the grotesque

[31] August von Kotzebue, *Ausgewählte prosaische Schriften*, XXXVIII (Wien, 1843), 76. See also XVIII (1842), 42, and XXXVIII, 79.

[32] *Heine-Briefe*, ed. Hans Daffis, I (Berlin, 1906), 68.

[33] Heine, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Ernst Elster (Meyers Klassiker-Ausgaben, Leipzig, n.d.), II, 58, 37; IV, 103.

China in the beginning of *The Romantic School* (1834),[35] where he used the metaphor to characterize Brentano's poetry as whimsical and bizarre: "Do you know China, the fatherland of winged dragons and porcelain teapots? The whole country is a cabinet of curiosities, surrounded by an inhumanly long wall and by a hundred thousand Tartar sentinels."

The Romantic School was written in Paris, and it was there also that Heine once used the Chinese metaphor for unmistakably political purposes. I refer to the poem "Der Kaiser von China" which appeared first in 1842 in the *Pariser Deutsche Zeitung*.[36] The Chinese emperor of this poem was the Prussian king, Frederick William IV, who had ascended the throne in 1840. He was represented as being always intoxicated, and as having as his court wizard the philosopher Confucius, i.e., Schelling, who became professor in Berlin in 1841. The romantic Prussian king was also lampooned as a promoter of mediaeval reaction. The Chinese emperor of the poem desired to complete the Grand Pagoda, i.e., the Cologne Cathedral, in order to counteract the spirit of the Revolution. He would baptize all the Jews and decorate them with the Order of the Dragon, i.e., the Prussian Order of the Black Eagle. He did not want any constitution, but believed in his intoxicated frenzy that he could make his subjects happy by the discipline of the big stick.

Compared with this vitriolic attack upon Prussian reaction, the liberal poems of Hoffmann von Fallersleben[37] appear innocuous. And yet, because of these poems, the brave poet lost his professorship at Breslau University. In his *Unpolitische Lieder* he used the Chinese metaphor even before Heine. Hoffmann's principal reason, which contributed to the ironical title of his collection, seems to have been to mislead the censor. He also wrote a "Türkische Liturgie" and a poem with the title "Minister-Weisheit. Aus dem Japonesischen." His "Herbstlied eines Chinesen" of February 23, 1841 could easily have been the "Autumn Song of a Prussian" since it was a Prussian who here complained that necessary political reforms were always deferred on account of the people's so-called political immaturity.

In the "Chinesisches Loblied" of May 3, 1841, Hoffmann, on the surface, demanded standing armies. But his real meaning became clear when he mockingly complained that a life without parades and without

[34] Heine, *Briefe*, ed. Hugo Bieber (Berlin, 1914), p. 119. Quoted by Michael Birkenbihl in *Analecta Germanica, Hermann Paul zum 7. August 1906 dargebracht* (Amberg, 1906), p. 274.

[35] Heine, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Ernst Elster (Leipzig, n.d.), V, 307.

[36] Heine, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Elster, I, 313-314. For the interpretation of this poem, see Heine, *Poëmes et légendes*, nouvelle éd. (Paris, 1859), pp. 194-195.

[37] Hoffmann von Fallersleben, *Auswahl*, ed. Augusta Weidler-Steinberg (Berlin, n.d.) II, 80, 73. See also Christian Petzet, *Die Blütezeit der deutschen politischen Lyrik* (Munich, 1903), p. 72.

Zapfenstreich (= taps) would be a miserable life indeed. Hoffmann's liberalism, like the liberalism of most of his contemporaries, was consistently antimilitaristic.

A little less heavy than Hoffmann's poems were the Berolinian witticisms of his disciple Adolf Glassbrenner.[38] Glassbrenner's use of the Chinese metaphor was less specific as well as more acid. He knew perfectly well why he published his *Verbotene Lieder* anonymously in Bern, Switzerland. In one of his poems he called China the freest monarchy of the world because its emperor was most "beschränkt." The point of this pun was that the emperor of this "nearby monarchy" was most restricted by his constitution as well as most limited in his mental capacities. In another poem Glassbrenner advised the poor Chinese to cut down all their genealogical trees in order to get the much-needed wood for keeping themselves warm. And a third poem which first bore the title "Allerhöchste Logik" was later renamed "Logik des chinesischen Absolutismus" (in the third edition of the *Verbotene Lieder* which appeared as *Gedichte* under the full name of the author in 1851).

Although Heine, Hoffmann von Fallersleben, and Glassbrenner showed a deep interest in politics, they were not so absorbed in it as the authors of Young Germany proper. In these authors, too, we find the political use of the Chinese metaphor.

Hermann Marggraff[39] wrote two journalistic articles employing Chinese motifs. The one bears the title "Schinschu in der Registratur des Marionetten-Theaters in Peking" and claims to have been translated from the Chinese. Marggraff naively, or perhaps not so naively, ascribes to the Chinese a German kind of life, "deutsch gemüthlich," contemplative and absorbed in universal studies. A young Chinese playwright by the name of Schinschu was seized by the "gigantic" *Zeitgeist* and awakened to progressive ideas. But Schinschu's play was not produced, and he ended his manuscript with the confession that poetry was sickness. With Marggraff this ending had no romantic meaning, as one might at first assume. On the contrary, he wanted his readers to get away from mere poetry and try prosaic political writing instead.

Marggraff's other article, which also claims to be based on original Chinese sources, is called "Eine chinesische Klein Kindertragödie." Here Schinschu's play is characterized as pleading for "the victory of the flesh over the wood" of the marionettes and as fighting against the antiquated abuse of abandoning unwanted children ("Kinderaussetzung"). Emissaries of this propaganda, which was termed the prop-

[38] *Verbotene Lieder. Von einem norddeutschen Poeten* (Bern, 1844), pp. 90, 98, 23 (= *Gedichte*, 3rd ed., Bern, 1851, p. 102). See also Petzet, *op. cit.* p. 62, and Arthur Mueller's poem, "Aus Ucker-China," *Deutsche Literatur, Reihe Politische Dichtung*, V (Leipzig, 1930), 138-139, 286.

[39] Hermann Marggraff, *Bücher und Menschen* (Bunzlau, 1837), pp. 115, 123, 134-135, 149.

aganda of "Young China," were said to be active in Germany also. "Emancipation of the flesh" certainly was one of the main slogans of Young Germany.

Another Young German, Theodor Mundt,[40] knew Chinese civilization a little more intimately. In 1832 he wrote an article on Chinese novels for an encyclopaedia and there accused the Chinese of a "disconsolate spiritual dryness." Later on, in 1846, he admitted in his *Allgemeine Literaturgeschichte* that Chinese civilization was rigid only in its appearance, while actually it abounded in original personalities and in scientific works of considerable importance. Still, he too found that the Chinese patriarchal principle was killing all history and that the Chinese system was a mere police system, a crafty tyranny which held all spiritual and scientific life in tutelage. He also pointed out in unmistakable words that China had become the prototype and symbol of many modern conditions.

A year later, in 1847, there appeared the anonymous pamphlet, *Chinesische Zustände*,[41] which satirized German conditions in the manner of Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World*. Here, too, China was taken as a synonym of reaction, but Germany was contrasted with China as being at times even more reactionary. On one page, for instance, the author spoke of the "brilliant misery" of the Chinese soldiers, who in a typical Occidental manner were shouted at, boxed on the ears, and abused on the squares of Nanking. On another page Chinese science with its exemplary specialization was called superior to Occidental science with its rigorous systems which bound free lecturers in fetters. This pamphlet was obviously put together hastily and did not always achieve clarity of thought or expression. But reactionary China generally stood for reactionary Germany.

Albert Dulk, a camp follower of Young Germany, used the Chinese metaphor as late as 1867.[42] In the manuscript of an Aristophanian comedy, *Die Gänse*, he satirized German princes as owners of Chinese goose hatcheries. The goose in German language is frequently used as a synonym for female stupidity.

Another group of liberal poets also used China as a metaphor for reaction, but not specifically for German reaction. Anastasius Grün[43] in a poem of 1835 compared an aloe plant to a mandarin. Just as the man-

[40] *Conversations-Lexikon der neuesten Zeit und Literatur*, I (Leipzig, 1832), 413-415; and Mundt's *Allgemeine Literaturgeschichte*, I (Berlin, 1846), 173, 157-159.

[41] *Chinesische Zustände. Leben und Treiben in China, mit humoristisch-satyrischen Rückblicken auf deutsche Verhältnisse von A. P.* (Grimma, 1847), pp. 7-8, 10, 19, 33, 15.

[42] See Ernst Rose, *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, XI (1923), 120.

[43] Anastasius Grün, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Anton Schlossar (Leipzig, n.d.), II, 89-90.

darin had one independent thought every hundred years, so the aloe plant had new flowers at the same intervals.

Although Anastasius Grün's comparison may appear a bit farfetched, it is still more poetic than Heinrich Stieglitz' *Bilder des Orients*, which appeared in 1831-33. This is the same Stieglitz whose wife Charlotte committed her notorious suicide in order to stir up the poetic imagination of her phlegmatic husband. In reading his *Bilder des Orients* one understands why her action could never have succeeded. For Stieglitz was no poet. He could join his lines by hackneyed or by labored rhymes, he could arbitrarily change his meters, he could try to shine by tedious anachronisms. But he had no new vision to offer. All he ever did was put Hegelian ideas into boring verses. It has been said that he was inspired by Victor Hugo's *Orientales* (1829), but the inspiration was hardly skin-deep. One volume[44] of Stieglitz' work was devoted to China, and depicted on some 250 pages the performance of a Chinese historical play. Stieglitz introduced quite a number of characters, such as beggars, jesters, tea merchants, town criers, pastry bakers, artists, and priests, but awakened none of them to real life. The summary of this soporific verse tale was the Hegelian thesis that China did not change:[45]

> . . . wir bleiben was wir waren,
> Und sind noch heut wie vor viel tausend Jahren.

Even Stieglitz' contemporaries could muster little enthusiasm for his academic doggerel. The critic F. G. Kühne, who tried to affect some sympathy, described Stieglitz' image of China as the image of a country caught in a mysterious tetany.

Much more spirited than Stieglitz' *Bilder des Orients* was Karl Gutzkow's novel *Maha Guru* (1833),[46] the story of a Dalai Lama who doubted his assumed character of a god and finally became a human being again. In this he was helped considerably by his brother, who dethroned Maha Guru in order to be able to lead a normal married life. But the normal marriage of the Tibetans was a polyandrous marriage, and thus Gutzkow, the protagonist of Young German "emancipation of the flesh," wrote here in defense of his program.

In the theocratic system destroyed by Maha Guru, the Chinese played an important part. They were its worldly arm and thus were introduced as allies of reaction. But for Gutzkow it was a weak and stupid reaction which in the end was clearly defeated. His Chinese were most tedious creatures, stiff in their gestures, wordy and long-winded in their speech,

[44] Heinrich Stieglitz, *Bilder des Orients* (Leipzig, 1831-33), IV, 81-323: "China." See on him Selden, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-215.

[45] Stieglitz, *op. cit.*, p. 93; see Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Weltgeschichte*, ed. Lasson (Leipzig, 1923), II, 278.

[46] Carl Gutzkow, *Maha Guru, Geschichte eines Gottes* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1833).

spending days over unessential trifles. "Suspicion, ambition, and deception are the unholy trinity of Chinese vices." The Chinese women were vain clothes horses, their mandarins crafty and greedy, their servants effeminate. Their soldiers toyed with umbrellas and cardboard cannons. Gutzkow apparently had read a great number of European descriptions of China, and almost half of his chapters opened with a quotation from a Chinese writer. But he never bothered to study the realities of Chinese life and merely used the slogans coined by others as a convenient vehicle for his liberal ideas.

These slogans were accepted even by the opponents of liberalism, who sometimes came to the defense of conservative China. Instances are found in the voluminous writings of the witty Prince Hermann von Pückler-Muskau, on the whole a political conservative and a representative of feudal *savoir vivre*, although he delighted in decorating himself with a snobbish *Weltschmerz* and with Young German catch phrases.

On several pages of his *Tutti Frutti* (1834)[47] he excused the Chinese for calling the British people barbarians; according to him, the British representatives had behaved with the supreme arrogance of drunkards. Unfortunately, the Chinese were impressed by British imperialism, like the Germans who were so very similar to the Chinese. On a later page Pückler-Muskau described Confucianism as related to Christianity. Both religions had been equally ineffective in improving the world.

In another book, *Griechische Leiden* (1840-41),[48] Pückler-Muskau offered a few "fragments from the letters of a Chinese traveling in Europe," and had his correspondent chide the so-called civilized countries for forgetting true religion and indulging instead in deception and lies, robbery, and murder. These Chinese letters of Pückler-Muskau look like the direct offspring of the many similar letters by Chinese and other Orientals that were so popular in eighteenth-century Europe. The Chinese in *Griechische Leiden* is the noble Chinese of the Enlightenment, and Pückler-Muskau here unmistakably betrays himself as a late son of that period.

The Young German writers were few in number, and for fear of the censor they could not afford to be too outspoken in their works. Is it a wonder that many of their contemporaries gave up all political action or did not even dare think of politics? Quietism characterizes a whole class of literary products of the nineteenth century, a quietism symbolized by the literary figure of Herr Biedermeier, whose name has come to stand for harmless and mostly boring, but also often comical, correctness. The people of the Biedermeier class restricted their attention to "Küche,

[47] *Tutti Frutti. Aus den Papieren eines Verstorbenen*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart, 1834), V, 241-244; III, 33, 99-100.

[48] *Südöstlicher Bildersaal*, II-III: *Griechische Leiden* (Stuttgart, 1840-41), pp. 392-406.

Kirche und Kinder." They enjoyed tedious descriptions of prevailing conditions à la Stieglitz and delighted in harmless tomfooleries, but avoided the excitements of world politics. The work of such writers was often a kind of literary dope, and the number of literary dope fiends increased somewhat after the Revolution of 1848 had proved a failure. Originally, this quietism had developed from late romanticism, and its representatives were primarily writers from the middle classes. But among them were also a few noblemen who naturally felt cynical about the spreading bourgeois revolution.

While a conservative like Pückler-Muskau felt called upon to defend the Chinese and while the writers of the liberal school were violently attacking them, the Biedermeier writers refused to take them seriously. To them the Chinese were merely strange to the point of absurdity and absurd to the point of ridiculousness. The ideas of the middle classes about China one may find conveniently summarized in a popular textbook of the time, A. W. Grube's *Geographische Charakterbilder* (1850).[49] This compilation accentuated every aspect of Chinese civilization that European snobbery had found strange and comical. All Chinese food was said to be prepared with castor oil (!) and consequently to be revolting to the stomach. Chinese soldiers were said to be dressed like tight-rope walkers and to behave like the worst cowards. Chinese parents were accused of habitually abandoning their unwanted infant daughters and of tightly lacing the feet of those daughters they decided to rear, so that these feet finally assumed the appearance of horses' hooves. It would be preposterous to seek in China any ideal religion or science; even Confucian philosophy was only a collection of moral rules for the regulation of practical affairs. The Chinese were disdained as greedy and crafty. Their so-called culture was haughtily characterized as mere shellac and artificiality, if not as a stagnant swamp (Grube spoke of "Versumpfung chinesischer Kultur"!). Translate these ideas into poetic images, and you have the Chinese of Biedermeier literature.

There was the Chinese Lu-Hong-Tschin who, in an anonymous love song[50] composed between 1800 and 1814, asked his chubby ("dicke") Yang to let him touch the end of her nose and so become engaged. There were the Chinese characters of the comedies of the nineteenth century, which continued a French stage fashion of the eighteenth century.[51]

[49] A. W. Grube, *Geographische Charakterbilder in abgerundeten Gemälden aus der Länder- und Völkerkunde*, II, 14th ed. (Leipzig, 1875), 121-151, 141, 131, 144, 133-134, 137, 142. His sources were translations from the French, the English, and the Russian.

[50] The text is given in Richard Zoozmann, *Unartige Musenkinder* (Leipzig, 1914), p. 631.

[51] On this fashion see Pierre Martino, *L'Orient dans la littérature française au XVII^e et au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1906), pp. 233, 248, and Schwartz, *op. cit.*, pp. 181-182. See also Henri Cordier, *La Chine en France au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1910).

They were especially popular in southern Germany, with its pronounced baroque taste. Staberl, the Viennese clown invented by Bäuerle, was sent to China in Ulrich von Destouches' slapstick comedy, *Staberl als Chinese* (1853),[52] and naturally had a field day ridiculing all the foreign customs he did not understand. In Georg Niedermayer's musical comedy, *Staberl in China oder Der Sohn des Himmels*,[53] Staberl, the representative of Viennese humor, in the end became himself the emperor of China. Another funny Chinese was Hermann Herzenskron's Hoang-Puff in the comedy of the same name (1826),[54] which he adapted from the French. This Hoang-Puff was a Chinese governor who, in spite of his frequent flares of anger, was really a coward in continuous fear of his life. He was just such a comical despot as the Chinese emperor in Louis Angely's comedy *Prinz Tu-Ta-Tu*,[55] which likewise was adapted from the French. Angely's emperor threatened to cut off the right ear of every foreigner. But he was also mortally afraid of the nonexistent fly sitting on his nose. When Prince Tu-Ta-Tu freed him from this idiosyncrasy, the emperor gave him the ridiculous title "Restorer of the Independence of my Smeller" ("Hersteller der Unabhängigkeit meines Geruchswerkzeuges"). One is inevitably reminded of Gilbert and Sullivan's *Mikado* (1885), which also entertained Western audiences at the expense of Orientals.

Even the more serious writers who acquired literary fame indulged in the idea of the funny Chinaman. Annette von Droste-Hülshoff in her poem "Der Teetisch" of 1839 dreamed of a "Kiosk"[56]

> Wo der tränenreiche Bube,
> Der Chinese, zaubernd waltet;
> Von der rosenfarbnen Rolle
> Liest er seine Zauberreime,
> Verse, zart wie Seidenwolle,
> Süsz wie Jungfernhonigseime.

Red Chinamen on a silken tapestry were used by Adalbert Stifter as a

[52] I could not obtain a copy of this play. Like most of Destouches' plays, it has probably never been printed. See Brümmer, *Lexikon der deutschen Dichter und Prosaisten vom Beginn des 19. Jhs. bis zur Gegenwart*, 6th ed. (Leipzig, n.d.), II, 6-7.

[53] Georg Niedermayer, *Ein Pagenstreich. Das 25Jährige Doctorjubiläum. Staberl in China* (Regensburg, 1877). The book also contains a score for *Staberl in China*.

[54] Hermann Herzenskron, *Dramatische Kleinigkeiten*, I (Wien, 1826), 63-103: "Hoang-Puff. Posse in einem Akte." The French model was written by Louis-Charles Caigniez (1762-1842) and a certain Louis unknown to me. Or can the German printer (or author) have made Caigniez' first name into the name of another author?

[55] Louis Angely, *Neustes komisches Theater*, I (Hamburg, 1836), 255-307. It was adapted from the French of Sauvage.

[56] A. v. Droste-Hülshoff, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Julius Schwering (Berlin, 1912), I, 145-147; VI, 116. The date is according to Hermann Cardauns, *Annette von Droste-Hülshoff und ihre Werke*, 3rd ed. (Gotha, 1911), p. 159.

symbol for the artificiality of the hero in his *Waldsteig* (1845).[57] When he again became a normal human being, the tapestry Chinamen had to go. China as a symbol for artificiality was also employed by Wilhelm Raabe in his *Schüdderump* of 1869.[58] The life of the unmarried noblewoman, Adelaide Klotilde Paula von St. Trouin, was called a Chinese shadow play. "There is a tripping and skipping and affected behavior as of the figures on a rococo ladies' fan. One smiles and curtsies as on old punch bowls and tea cups and takes for a walk very abnormal little animals under the very abnormal trees and bushes of one's imagination, while astonishingly strange birds whiz through the air." This description reminds one of Moritz von Schwind's (1840-71) charming picture, "Siesta einer chinesischen Familie," where a whole Chinese family takes its afternoon nap in a hammock extended between two delicate trees. In 1848, Schwind drew two equally precious Chinese lovers for the Munich comic periodical *Fliegende Blätter*.

Less known than Schwind, Raabe, Stifter, and Annette von Droste-Hülshoff is Alexander von Ungern-Sternberg, who in 1846 published his tale *Tutu*.[59] Here we learn of three artful Chinese automatons which were supposed to bore a royal princess and thus cure her insomia. One of the automatons represented a poet with a repulsive monosyllabic name who again and again read the same skits with the same insipid gestures, and who was imitated by numerous authors of tedious, dry, and absurd farcical comedies which caused everybody to yawn. When the automaton refused to be stopped, the whole castle fell into a sound sleep.

Another strange work was Julius Grosse's verse tale, *Hilpah und Schalum, eine vorsündflutliche Geschichte, gesungen in der langathmigen, geschnörkelten chinesischen grünen Theeweis*.[60] Although it appeared in 1871, it was dedicated in ironical fashion to the "highly esteemed Biedermeier," and reminds one of the Biedermeier style. The tale is supposed to take place in prehistoric China, but the names are really Hebrew. In the introduction Grosse spoke of the present-day Chinese as tearful, sentimental tea drinkers reading old legends.

The Biedermeier picture of China was so ridiculous that it early evoked a parody by Ludwig Eichroth, the creator of the Biedermeier figure. In his poem "Wanderlust" (1848), which took its cue from Goe-

[57] Adalbert Stifter, *Erzählungen* (Leipzig, Insel-Verlag, n.d.), p. 472.

[58] Wilhelm Raabe, *Der Schüdderump, Sämtliche Werke* (Berlin-Grunewald, n.d.), 3rd series, I, 14. He also describes the Chinese as "strange" in *Die Leute aus dem Walde* (1861-62), *Sämtliche Werke*, 1st series, V. 371. The same connotation can be found in Jeremias Gotthelf, *Uli der Pächter* (1849); see Ferdinand Vetter's ed. (Bern, 1899), p. 94.

[59] A. v. (Ungern-) Sternberg, *Tutu, phantastische Episoden und poetische Excursionen* (Leipzig, 1846), pp. 100-101.

[60] Julius Grosse, *Pesach Pardel* (Halle, 1871), p. 140.

the's "Mignon," he had the following stanza on an absolutely quiet China inhabited by innumerable people, among them women mutilating their feet:[61]

Nach Chinesien, nach Chinesien
Möcht ich, wo ich nie gewesigen,
Wo die Seelen stille stehn,
Wo die Menschen wahrhaft wimmeln,
Frauen ihren Fusz verstümmeln,
Und der Tusch am schwärzesten—
Dahin, Alter, lasz mich ziehn!

Most chinoiseries of the Biedermeier literature are now forgotten. But there is one exception, Adolf E. Ellissen's poem, "Der Pinsel Mings," which was published in 1840.[62] Here the arbitrariness of popular fame was ridiculed in the form of a magic brush which was presented by a liberated demon to the misunderstood Chinese poet Scheu-Gung and made him write superb poetry. When the demon took the brush away again, Scheu-Gung's verses became dreadful, but nobody noticed the difference, since he had become famous. Ellissen's poem has a quiet charm that can please even today. As a translator of Chinese poetry he knew the Chinese and could enliven his poem with local color. Hans Hopfen, who in 1868 expanded Ellissen's sixteen stanzas into a whole epic, did not know China and therefore made the Chinese whimsical clowns in the prevailing stage fashion. A later version of the same story, Hanns von Gumppenberg's comedy, *Der Pinsel Yings* (1914), is far better; but it belongs to a later period.

Conclusion

The picture of China as a reactionary, sleepy nation where no evolution toward a higher ideal was possible, continued to occupy German minds almost up to World War II. Numerous poems and comedies could be cited to show the popularity of this idea. Works could also be cited to demonstrate the continuity of the tradition of the funny Chinaman.

However, after the middle of the nineteenth century, the China image of the leading German poets, as of most Westerners,[63] slowly began to

[61] *Musenklänge aus Deutschlands Leierkasten*, neu herausgegeben von Adolf Thimme, I. Faksimiledruck der Ausgabe von 1849 (Meersburg am Bodensee and Leipzig, 1936), p. 25. Such ideas were of course not restricted to Germany. See Byron's allusion to "small-eyed China's crockery-ware metropolis" (*Don Juan*, XI, 7) and his description of a mandarin: "his manner suffers not to guess That anything he views can greatly please" (*Don Juan*, XIII, 34 [35]).

[62] Ernst Rose, "Das Schicksal einer angeblich chinesischen Ballade," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XXXII (1933), 392-396.

[63] See Mason, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-74, especially p. 74. Even American literature did not differ from the general pattern. According to North, *op. cit.*, p. 86, poetic treatment of Chinese life before 1850 was generally severe, while the 1880s clearly saw

change. The outbreak of hostilities between England and China in 1840 perhaps started the gradual breakdown of the old conventional concepts. Through this so-called "Opium War" China became an integral part of world trade; Prussia concluded her first trade pact with China in 1861. At the same time, German Sinology began to advance independently of its French and English models. As a result, German poets and philosophers started to take China seriously. Shortly after 1850, young Paul Heyse treated China sympathetically.[64] For a long time he stood alone. Then came the French Far Eastern fashion initiated by Théophile Gautier and the brothers Goncourt,[65] which probably had its beginnings in America.[66] That fashion could not fail to have its reverberations in Germany. At the turn of the century Paul Ernst[67] saw in China a model of social organization, and Hermann Hesse[68] discovered in Chinese philosophy certain elements of eternal truth. This new idea of China attained such a hold on academic and educated circles that after World War I Chinese philosophy could be cultivated by many as an antidote against defeatism. The new image of China was well on its way towards popularity.

New York University

---

pro-Chinese poets in the ascendancy. See also George H. Danton, *The Culture Contacts of the United States and China* (New York, 1931), p. 100. On a parallel change in English literature, see H. L. Seaver, "The Asian Lyric and English Literature," *Essays in Memory of Barrett Wendell* (Cambridge, Mass., 1926), pp. 235-256.

[64] See my article "Chinesische Motive beim jungen Heyse," *Ger. Rev.*, XII (1937), 165-176.

[65] See Schwartz's work mentioned in note 4 above.

[66] See Adolf Brüning, "Der Einfluss Chinas und Japans auf die europäische Kunst," *Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte*, XV (1900), 281-296; Van Wyck Brooks, *New England: Indian Summer, 1865-1915* (New York, 1940), pp. 358-372.

[67] See Ernst Rose, "Paul Ernst und China," *MLQ*, IV (1943), 313-328.

[68] Hermann Hesse, *Eine Bibliothek der Weltliteratur* (Leipzig n.d.), pp. 13-14, 43-45.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Method of Interpreting Literature. By Leo Spitzer. Northampton: Smith College, 1949. 149 p.

Leo Spitzer's three lectures, delivered at Smith College in 1948 and here placed between covers, illustrate the method of critical appraisal which he has applied long and consistently, in many books and articles that take all cultures as their province and that command respectful attention from an international audience. Even more notably than for many scholars, for Spitzer "Methode ist Erlebnis." His purpose is to persuade the reader that his *method* is valid; his subjects range from Donne, St. John of the Cross, Wagner, and Voltaire to an advertisement for Sunkist oranges.

What is his method? He has argued it most clearly in the first chapter of a previous book, *Linguistics and Literary History, Essays in Stylistics* (Princeton, 1948). Roughly, it consists in moving from minute linguistic analysis of a text to larger and larger conclusions supposedly induced from such stylistic evidence, conclusions which may be aesthetic, psychological, philosophical, or historical. *Ex ungue leonem.* The method is *explication de texte* which acknowledges no limits to its validity or subject matter. It assumes that "Wortwandel ist Kulturwandel und Seelenwandel." Its brilliant practitioners—Spitzer himself, E. R. Curtius, Erich Auerbach, Dámaso Alonso, Charles S. Singleton, to whom this book is dedicated—form an easily recognizable school. They might be called the Philologians in the older and more honored sense of the term. They are not narrow linguists, since they use their encyclopaedic stylistic knowledge towards important ends. They differ from ordinary historical scholars in placing primary emphasis on the work of art. They differ from our English and American New Critics in their deeper learning, their wider conception of what is relevant in aesthetic judgments, and, perhaps, in their slighter personal experience as creative artists.

Their goal is admirable. More than any critical school at any time past or present, they are aware of all of the elements that should enter into the act of literary judgment.

But their method may claim more than, as method, it can perform. Spitzer is aware of possible philosophical objections. How does one make the transition from the "grammatical" to the psychological or "divinatory" explanation of a work of art, when both are required in hermeneutics? Spitzer presents the objection, in Professor Harold Cherniss's phrasing: "It is a vicious circle to intuit the nature of the author's personality from his writings and then to interpret those writings in accordance with the 'inner necessity' of that intuited personality." Yet Spitzer argues eloquently that the philological circle is necessary, that Pascal's *esprit de finesse* is the method of the humanities. With such a battery as Dilthey, Schleiermacher, Heidegger, Rosenzweig, and Wolf, he presents his case for the "Zirkel im Verstehen" as the needful operation of the human mind: "the detail can be understood only by the whole and any explanation of detail presupposes the understanding of the whole." His metaphor for his own critical action is the "to-and-fro voyage from certain outward details to the inner center and back again to other series of details."

In practice, however, there is always a jump, which logic cannot bridge, between the close stylistic analysis and the value judgment on the whole. The strength and influence of the Philologians depend largely upon their individual literary sensitivity and sympathy. Their weakness lies in attributing infallibility to the system itself, perhaps still a holdover from nineteenth-century Germany's ambition to make literary studies a science. Spitzer wishes to achieve "the more rigorously scientific definition of an individual style, the definition of a linguist which should replace the casual, impressionistic remarks of literary critics." Yet he admits on one occasion, "I had first followed the inductive method—or rather a quick intuition." Again, he realizes rightly the complexities of literature, explaining the artist almost in terms of *Gestaltpsychologie*: "The mind of an author is a kind of solar system into whose orbit all categories of things are attracted." Yet he also holds that "the life-blood of the poetic creation is everywhere the same," and tends in his own practice to simplify a writer to a phrase, an "inward life-center."

Take one example: "Voltaire, unlike Pascal, but no less great an *écrivain*, uses his style, not to bring man back to God by suasion, but to compensate for the inner solitude of the man without God and to give him at least the sense of mental triumph." Excellent and just as this *aperçu* is (and these three lectures are full of similar judgments), it is hardly demonstrable through stylistics. If it were, then literary opinion would be as unchangeable as a quadratic equation.

Let us follow Professor Spitzer in one of his analyses. In his first lecture, he uses his system to explain "Three Poems on Ecstasy" by Donne, St. John of the Cross, and Richard Wagner. The problem is to define the almost ineffable, to progress from style to the mystic state. His careful study illuminates all three of his subjects. He begins by rebutting Karl Shapiro's definition of a poem as "a literary construct composed of not-words," and by substituting his own suggestion that poetry "consists of words, with their meaning *preserved*, which through the magic of the poet who works within a 'prosodic' whole, arrive at a sense-beyond-sense." The philologist as critic "will patiently and analytically retrace the way from the rational to the irrational: a distance which the poet may have covered in one bold leap." He then quotes Donne's "The Extasie" entire, and traces how two phenomena, the separation of soul from body (the *ekstasis* proper) and the union of the two souls of Donne's lovers, are described in the poem. He has a paragraph on the intellectual argument, and another on the attitude of the poet toward his assumed audience. He shows how the reader is to be convinced through the quantitative technique of multiplying illustrations, similes, and new coinages. He speaks of the effect of Donne's rhythms and of his use of hyperbole to suggest the ecstatic state, not directly describable, by introducing "the unvisualizable possibilities of the impossible." So far, though the philological emphasis is not insistent, Spitzer's observations are helpful, and are "scientific" in that they can be demonstrated in the text or in the facts of history.

But now he observes that the last part of the poem "is poetically less successful than the rest." This is an undemonstrated assumption with which all readers would not agree. It is an arbitrary exercise of taste comparable to Quiller-Couch's original printing of the first section of this poem in *The Oxford Book of English Verse* as if it were the entire poem. Spitzer's procedure becomes rhetorical rather than scientific when he reiterates his judgment in this form: "Any reader must feel here a poetic anti-climax." The assumption is based on interpretations (that "forbeare" in the poem means "tolerate," and that the last phrase, "when we'are to bodies gone," refers to the inevitable return from ecstasy to everyday life) which I, for one, cannot accept. The assumption leads to an explanation which again will cause some lovers of Donne to raise their eyebrows:

"Moreover, *we feel somehow* [my italics] that Donne himself, in spite of his endeavor to justify the flesh, was more intimately convinced of the reality and beauty of the spiritual union than of the necessity of the body for that union."

To support such an intuition, Spitzer turns to speculations in the current of ideas. He finds in Donne (Is he aware of his upbringing and his wavering?) a "basically Protestant mind," and therefore suggests that Donne was tormented by the "estrangement from the body . . . characteristic of Protestantism," as opposed to the Jewish faith and the Catholic religion.

Still working on general classifications, he now attacks "Gallic worldly wisdom" as exemplified in Professor Legouis' interpretation of the poem as a sophistical and insidious plea for physical consummation. In contrast, "*I have chosen*," he writes, "simply to believe the poet when he speaks, at the beginning, with the unmistakable voice of truth, of the beauty, and reality, of the spiritual ekstasis: and if we do believe him here, *we can not, then*, see in the last part an invitation to carnality." Certainly we cannot, if we assume that Donne had to feel as a Protestant, and that no Protestant sensed the bridge from soul to body. But the proof for such assumptions? It is Spitzer who is here writing as the Protestant and puritan; he seems unaware of Eliot's famous phrase, "the dissociation of sensibility," which characterizes, unfortunately for latter poetry and for "ecstasy," not the *scuola di* Donne, but the national dichotomies that followed. Neither Spitzer's nor Legouis' interpretation—since each is partial—does injustice to the *doctor subtilis*, who described any world easily and naturally in terms of some other world, and who revelled in incompatibilities and sudden salient questionings.

Spitzer's quest for the circle's center is excitingly successful in St. John of the Cross and in Voltaire; here his method seems applicable and justified. His bold confidence in the method (and the limits of Spitzer's aesthetic field are as extensive as Croce's) sheds light on Isolde's *Liebestod* as poetry and produces interesting speculations on the American mind in a ranging analysis of the advertising text, plus its illustration:

"From the sunkist groves in California
Fresh for you."

Disproportionately perhaps, this review has dwelt in some detail on one analysis, because a *method* of interpreting literature is the subject of the whole book. The method is not flawless in itself; it cannot specify the inevitable steps by which one proceeds from the details to the center of the circle. Sometimes Spitzer reconstructs the lion from the toenail; sometimes he explains a toenail because he knows what a lion is. Taste, intuition, a certain arbitrary procedure, cannot help entering into his practice. The man surpasses the method. It is fortunate that in Spitzer sympathy and sensitivity match an exhaustive erudition. If we cannot imitate him in method, we can at least take to heart what he practices and what he quotes with approval from Lanson, touring the United States forty years ago: "*Read your texts!*"

DONALD A. STAUFFER.

Princeton University

THE TESTAMENT OF WERTHER IN POETRY AND DRAMA. By Stuart Pratt Atkins. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949. 322 p.

Professor Atkins' account of the creative or pseudocreative responses which Goethe's *Werther* has elicited from writers of the Western world during approximately a hundred and fifty years reads like an instructive and at times highly amusing comment to the French *aperçu* that fame is nothing but a profound misunder-

standing; for what poets and playwrights in England, France, Germany, Italy, and Poland transmitted to their readers and spectators when conjuring up for them the beloved shadows of Werther and Lotte were much rather offsprings, and more often than not abortions, of "der Herren eigener Geist" than re-creations of Goethe's objective characters, problems, and moods. Atkins' book—scholarly, sober, and dispassionate in tone, abounding in source material, some of it ferreted from obscure hiding places—becomes a personal experience by driving home the melancholy lesson that the dividing line between popularity and notoriety is very slim indeed, and that the golden throne of fame ominously resembles an iron pillory. In the course of Atkins' discussion, it becomes evident that his presentation could serve as an excellent argument (if such argument be still needed) to explode the ever-rampant theory of "influences" of one author upon another; all the samples he assembles in his book are clearly "influenced" by one great work of literature, and yet it is only too plain that whatever is being assimilated is not determined by the intrinsic value of the object assimilated, but by the highly selective mental and emotional organism of the assimilator.

Such marginal, if not tangential, reflections are the by-product of a book which examines closely, and by marshalling an enormous wealth of material, the survival of Goethe's *Werther* in poetry and drama. What the author offers is the triumph, the magnetic fascination of a work of art which captivated the world; by telling the story of this triumph, he lays bare the nerve centers which reacted to this stimulus.

A clear curve of English literary taste can be traced from the reception of Goethe's novel as expressed in the innumerable imitations and allusions in poetry. The book rode to fame on the last waves of eighteenth-century sentimentalism, unleashed a tempest of sobs, sighs, and tears crystallizing in second-rate poetry—yet, on the other hand, called forth the indignation of all bigoted moralists who shuddered at what they considered the glorification of a mortal sin. (It is amusing and enlightening that these "Conservatives" shifted their own narrow-minded idiosyncrasies to the plane of national prejudice, condemning with and in Werther "German immorality and licentiousness.") Relatively soon, the Werther fever subsided in England; a politically and socially active generation found little to admire in Werther's pessimistic passivity, and, although the *Weltschmerz* of the romanticists could feed on Werther again, the Victorian temper buried the soulful suicide for good under a gale of laughter.

Somewhat similar is the curve that can be read from the Werther poetry in Germany, although the greater familiarity with the novel and with Goethe's later development mitigated somewhat the crass misunderstanding upon which so much of English Werther imitation was based. In France, the Werther idiom became fully intelligible relatively late, after the last vestiges of the literary *ancien régime* were destroyed, partly with the help of *Werther*. But from the days of romanticism on, the French cherished a book in which they rightly saw not only a document of the past fashion of sentimentalism, but one of the most masterful psychological novels of all times. Atkins' chapter on the dramatic treatment of the Werther theme proves only too clearly that the material stubbornly resisted any transformation into a different literary genre, and that all a playwright could do was to vulgarize the melodramatic elements of Goethe's novel.

This monograph on the history of a book is an extremely interesting chapter in comparative literature and, beyond that, a revealing investigation into the development and changes of literary taste in Europe. Since this literary taste is closely tied up with social and political transformations, Atkins has made a valuable contribution to the intellectual history of Europe during the last hundred and fifty years. To be sure, *Werther*, the object of all these mutations, gets lost

in the shuffle, and it might have clarified the case if Atkins had given us an objective interpretation of Goethe's novel, so that the reader, not too familiar with *Werther*, could measure against it all the distortions and dislocations poor Werther was subjected to in his conquest of Europe. And the student of intellectual history would have welcomed a somewhat more detailed and interpretative summary of Atkins' conclusions, which might have thrown into sharper relief the changes in literary taste. But, as it stands, the book is a real find for every comparatist and *Geisteswissenschaftler*—who, after reading it, will realize what treasures are bequeathed to him in the "testament" of one single book. The appendix, a ninety-page bibliography listing poetic and dramatic Werther treatments in fourteen different languages, testifies to a scholarly thoroughness from which many of Professor Atkins' fellows will reap great benefit in the future.

OSKAR SEIDLIN

Ohio State University

THE FRENCH ACADEMIES OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. By Frances A. Yates. London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1947. 376 p.

The encouragement given by the Warburg Institute to studies in the Renaissance has again produced a study broad in conception and thorough in execution. This volume brings together an immense quantity of documentation organized to show the functions of Baïf and Courville's *Académie de Musique* and its inner circle, the *Académie du Palais*, within the complex evolution of political and ecclesiastical events.

The author begins with a well-balanced account of the growth in scope and tone of the Italian academies, and traces their influence in France through Dorat and the Pléiade to the flowering in the next century. But the general scheme of the book is not chronological, since the author is interested in the French academies of the late sixteenth century, and in movements along the periphery, as illustrations of certain basic intellectual and social attitudes which are in varying degrees independent of historic event.

In the first place, the author examines the development of the *Académie de Musique* as a project to unite under the aegis of ancient music the whole range of human achievement, intellectual and artistic. This she speaks of as the "Encyclopaedia"; and she finds the concept becoming clear with the successive *Discours philosophiques* of Pontus de Tyard, schematized in Bartolomeo Delbene's *Civitas veri*, exemplified in the formal activities of the academies, and in retrospect appreciated by Marin Mersenne in 1623. Again, the book effectively presents the two academies and the groups centered at Vincennes as guided by the desire of Henri III and his wiser counsellors to reconcile the religious and political factions of his reign through a revival of devotion at the Court and in the City. Bizarre as this ruler was in character and practices, and extraordinary as were his sporadic devotional impulses, he healthily encouraged the pacification of his society through the provision in the Académie de Musique for members of the Reformed faith, while d'Aubigné himself was a member of the inner *Académie du Palais*.

The book devotes considerable attention to the place of men of letters in the Encyclopaedist movement. The contributions of Pontus de Tyard, of Ronsard, of Desportes, as well as of the prime mover Baïf, give the author an opportunity to set forth the use made in the academies of Renaissance mythological manuals, of the Platonic doctrine of the furors, and in general of that pagan-Christian symbolism so characteristic of this moment in the century.

Altogether, then, the author touches on an immense number of works, ideas,

and men. If on occasion she appears to be taking the reader somewhat further afield than he expects, he profits none the less by an increased familiarity with the febrile life of Paris under the third Henry. Her extensive quotations add vividness to the effect, though her translations into English are unnecessarily frequent; and there is a serviceable index. Unhappily the persistence of misprints in words leaves the reader concerned whether the bibliographical references are impeccable. But, on the whole, this is a solid and valuable addition to our knowledge of an intense moment in French cultural history.

ROBERT V. MERRILL

University of California at Los Angeles

MODERN LIBRARY COLLEGE EDITIONS. New York: The Modern Library.

Random House has made available in a new series of inexpensive (65 cents), paper-bound volumes some forty or more titles of the well-known Modern Library books. These reprints have been furnished with new bibliographies and newly written or revised introductions by scholars now teaching in American universities. In a few cases the older volume has been expanded (e.g., Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* has become *Leaves of Grass and Selected Prose*) or even entirely reset in order to present a more reliable text (*Scarlet Letter, Vanity Fair.*) An occasional new title has been added (e.g., *Seven Famous Greek Plays*, ed. Oates and O'Neill). Sixteen of the first forty volumes published in the new collection offer foreign classics, ancient and modern, in standard English translations. As the series grows, we may hope that the proportion of non-English works will suffer no decrease, and that the publishers will endeavor to secure poetical translations of poets and more accurate translations of some prose writers (e.g., Cervantes). All teachers of courses in world literature or great books will welcome these serviceable and moderately priced editions.

C. B. B.

CRITICISM AND CREATION: YALE FRENCH STUDIES, Vol. II, no. 1, Spring-Summer, 1949. Edited by Kenneth Douglas. 136 p.

The *Yale French Studies*, of twice yearly issue, is not an official publication, even of the liberal and ranging sort one might expect from the direction of Henri Peyre. It was founded by a graduate student, Robert Cohn, and continues to be edited, with high taste and intelligence, by graduate students and "junior members" of Yale's Romance Department. The distinctive and admirable policy of the series, which is neither a "journal" nor yet a series of separate monographs, has two tenets to be stressed: each issue has a special, unifying, and currently engaging topic (e.g., the first issue was devoted to "Existentialism," and the number next after "Criticism and Creation," that of Fall-Winter 1949, deals with "Literature and Ideas"); and secondly, the contributors are neither entirely Yale men nor yet, with "academic detachment," entirely enlisted from other institutions.

Since the issue I am noticing contains thirteen essays by as many contributors, some general comments seem more in order than a sentence or two pronouncing judgment on each study; and this method is especially apposite in a review of the book in *Comparative Literature* and a review which need not cavil, caution, or correct but only characterize and commend.

There have been other recent efforts at the reconciliation of "scholarship" and "criticism," those polar if not mutually hostile parties in academic-literary America. Their reconciliation is indeed by no means easy, either in theory or in

practice; yet without any programmatic claims to achieve it, "Criticism and Creation" offers a sensitive and subtle example of the desired. A fine flexibility in editorial judgment permits all sorts of degrees and combinations. Some of the papers are almost exclusively "historical" and factual; others very near to being "impressionistic"—but impressionistic in the fastidiously rigorous manner of Jules Lemaitre, to cite a distinguished earlier practitioner. Theoretical and "practical" criticism both appear—the former notably in two essays themselves markedly different in method and tone, yet both admirable—Angles on "The Critic: Trends and Temptations" and Hatzfeld on "Stylistic Criticism as Art-Minded Philology." Most of the essays titulaly concern a specific French critic or problem, yet there are few such essays without their theoretical implications or even their generalizing *aperçus*, while the brilliant and perceptive essay by Angles, in the process of illustrating types of criticism, penetrates Thibaudet and Du Bos, in a paragraph each, in a manner unachieved by many a monograph solely dedicated to a critic.

The essays most characteristic of the collection are neither "close criticism" in the current American mode nor yet uncontrolled grandiosities. They keep to their elected themes, but without relentless rigor; without confounding the critic and his object of criticism, they have delicacy, an enviable suppleness and pliancy. One symptomatic instance of these virtues is the absence of any orthodox length: Maurin, on Suarès, writes three pages; and it can be justly said of all thirteen authors that they stop when they come to the end of what they have to say.

I wish, fervently, that we had, in America, more such publications as the *Yale French Studies*.

A. W.

LETTERATURE COMPARATE. Edited by Attilio Momigliano et al. Milano: Marzorati, 1948. 382 p.

The somewhat sweeping title of this excellent work is better understood if we keep in mind that it appeared as the fourth volume of the *Problemi ed orientamenti critici di lingua e di letteratura italiana* series, and that it therefore deals with Italy's literary relations with her most important foreign partners. Of the seven skillfully condensed chapters, Antonio Viscardi writes on "La poesia trobadorica e l'Italia," Carlo Pellegrini on "Relazioni tra la letteratura italiana e la letteratura francese," Alda Croce on "Relazioni della letteratura italiana con la letteratura spagnuola," Mario Praz on "Rapporti tra la letteratura italiana e la letteratura inglese," and Vittorio Santoli on "La letteratura italiana, la tedesca e le nordiche." Concerning the remaining two chapters, we may wonder why Tommaso Sorbelli's "Relazioni fra la letteratura italiana e le letterature classiche" comes last instead of first, while Mario Sansone's "Relazioni fra la letteratura italiana e le letterature dialettali" is rather puzzling because, in spite of a few explanatory remarks in the Preface, one would not expect to find such a chapter incorporated in a book devoted to the international and comparative aspects of Italian literature. Each chapter is followed by several pages of bibliographical information, and the opinions of leading specialists are very often quoted in the chapters themselves, so that the entire book, besides its primary function of supplying us with a concise outline, also beautifully fulfills its secondary purpose of acquainting us with the present state of scholarship with regard to these problems. For these two reasons the work can be recommended to all lovers of Italian and of comparative literature.

Space and inclination allow me to discuss only four of the seven chapters. Mr. Pellegrini's chapter of Italo-French relations presents, in its fifty-eight pages, a

masterpiece of delicate balancing of the "debits" and "credits" in the five phases outlined: the trecentisti, the cinquecentisti, the theatre from Molière to Goldoni, the eighteenth century, and the period from Mme de Staël to d'Annunzio. What I like best in Pellegrini's contribution is his discreet refusal to stir up new trouble when speaking of the occasionally rather strained relations between the two countries. The anti-Italian statements by Boileau and Lamartine are relegated to the background, where they belong. The following lines characterize beautifully his tolerance and tactfulness when he comes to speak of Italy's anti-French attitude towards the end of the eighteenth century: ". . . ma non è il caso di esagerarne l'importanza, come qualche volta si è fatto, lasciandosi trasportare da considerazioni che debbono restare estranee al mondo degli studi. Del resto il fenomeno non è solo italiano, ma europeo, e proprio da questo contatto con la cultura francese ed europea la nostra letteratura attinse nuovo vigore, che avrebbe dato dopo non molto i suoi frutti." The only mistake I notice in this chapter concerns the date of Laurent de Premierfait's translations from Boccaccio (p. 50), which, though printed in 1485, had actually been made much earlier in the fifteenth century.

Though the general plan of the book called for the greatest condensation possible, few scholars will agree with Miss Croce's decision to begin her story of Italo-Spanish relations with the Aragonese in Naples in general and with Cariteo in particular—for that completely leaves out the earliest influences of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio (see, for instance, Sanvisenti, Savj-Lopez, Post, Farinelli, Hutton, etc.) and omits entirely, not only controversial figures like Imperial, but also Metge, Santillana, Mena, Rocaberti, Ausías March, and others. It is also strange that, in the discussion of sixteenth-century Petrarchism, Boscán should have been left out, though Navagero's ambassadorship is mentioned and Garcilaso de la Vega is discussed in some detail. Miss Croce's forty-four pages are crowded with rich information, although from the eighteenth century on, from the expelled Spanish Jesuits to Farinelli and Benedetto Croce, it often seems as if critics rather than poets kept alive (often in bitter polemics) whatever intellectual connections there were between the two countries. Miss Croce's discussion of poets proper breaks off with Leopardi, Manzoni, and Carducci.

In his fascinating discussion of Italo-English relations Mario Praz succeeds in offering not only a general outline of the vast field of Italian influences upon England and of English influences upon Italy (subdivisions 2-15 and 16-18 respectively), but also in bringing in astonishingly thorough discussions of many knotty problems, and in making quick allusions (e.g., connecting the *dolce stil nuovo* with the metaphysical poets, and comparing Donne's poems to those of Michelangelo) that are thought-provoking indeed. At the very beginning he states the broad yet acceptable generalization that Italy knew nothing of English literature before 1700 and that England knew very little about Italian literature (but increasingly much about the Italian landscape) after 1700; furthermore, that Italy inspired the greatest of English poets, while England inspired only minor Italian authors. Chaucer, the Elizabethans, and Milton are treated with such relative abundance that Italian influences on the English romantics and English influences upon Italy seem by comparison quite neglected. The only paragraphs which are not convincing are those dealing with the difficult problem of Chaucer and Boccaccio, for Mr. Praz has endeavored to show that Chaucer may have borrowed the idea of a worldly pilgrimage from Dante's other-worldly pilgrimage or that he may have assumed that not only Griseldis, but even the *Filostrato*, were Petrarch's works. The only passage in this deeply satisfying contribution where one might have wished for a somewhat fuller treatment concerns the influence of the Italian *novella* upon the Elizabethan drama; instead of the brief statement about Painter and Fenton, a

sentence or two might have been added on the preceding development from Boccaccio, da Porto, and Bandello to Boaistuau and Belleforest.

Professor Santoli's awkward idea of building up what should have been a simple bibliography at the end of his contribution into a bulky second essay of thirty pages forces the hapless reader, who is very often dissatisfied with the many gaps encountered in the thirty-three pages of the text proper, to scurry to the secondary essay to see whether it may not contain the information he is after. In the eleven puny pages discussing Italian influences upon German, Swiss, Dutch, and Scandinavian literatures, we find no references to Herold, to the Pegnitz shepherds, to Gryphius, or, to speak of our contemporaries, to the Italian influences upon Heinrich and Thomas Mann. Significant disciples of Italy like Hans Sachs, Meinhard, Jagemann, Waiblinger, Platen, Ricarda Huch, and Rilke are not mentioned in the text, though the bibliography gives some information about their indebtedness. The two very brief references to Goethe's *Tasso* and to the use of the *terza rima* in *Faust* certainly do not do justice to the very great problem of Goethe's debt to Italy, though here again the bibliography gives much additional information—which, for the sake of clarity and completeness, should have been put in the text proper. To give another example, the two lines on C. F. Meyer mean precious little unless complemented by the five titles mentioned in the bibliography. Very much better are Mr. Santoli's twenty-two pages on the Germanic influences upon Italy, from Klopstock and Monti to Carducci, Nietzsche, d'Annunzio, and Ibsen. But it must be said that his ample bibliography is really far more satisfactory than his very sketchy main contribution.

It is a pity that no index of proper names was added to this volume. It would have greatly enhanced the book's comparative value and our understanding if, by a glance at such an index, we could have seen how certain men (e.g., Giuseppe Baretti) were leading pioneers in Italy's interrelations with two or three or more foreign literatures.

W. P. F.

LA CONCORDE DES DEUX LANGAGES. Par Jean Lemaire de Belges. Édition critique par Jean Frappier. Paris: Droz, 1947. lxviii, 110 p.

In Professor Frappier's critical edition we finally have a reliable text of *La Concorde des deux langages* and a masterful treatment of many points raised by this remarkable and disconcerting work. It has been commonplace for scholars to bemoan the deficiencies of the Stecher edition of Lemaire's works (1882-91) and to do little about it. E. Lommatzsch's edition of the *Concorde*, based primarily on the first edition of 1513, was an improvement over Stecher's which had been made on the much later edition of 1549, but still was not a critical edition. Frappier had the new and good idea of using as the basic text the Carpentras manuscript, which antedates by two years the first printed edition of 1513. However, Frappier is not the slave of the manuscript version—it is just as easy, if not easier, for mistakes to occur in a manuscript as in print—and he checks it with the 1513 edition. Inasmuch as trace of Lemaire is lost shortly after 1514 or 1515, at least trace of his literary life, these two texts are rightly considered by the editor as the most authentic and are treated as such. Frappier also gives in notes all the variants of the 1549 edition, the last one until Stecher's, and adds numerous variants of other sixteenth-century editions. This reviewer, far from criticizing the editor for not including the variants of all the editions, which differ in spelling alone, feels that the apparatus is thus only easier to follow, although one must admit that for students interested in phonetic and orthographic changes just such variants could be very useful.

The year 1511, established by the Carpentras manuscript, makes the *terminus a quo* of the completion of the *Concorde* recede by two years, and the difference of those two years happens to be important for the clarification of many points related to Lemaire's biography and to the interpretation of the text. Some of these points are: Lemaire's relations with Marguerite of Austria, and with Louis XII and his wife, Anne of Brittany; the connection of the literary inspiration of the work with political exigencies; the place of the *Concorde* in relation to the other political writings of Lemaire; the still puzzling problem of the relationship of the several component parts of the *Concorde* with each other, their respective dates, etc. A definitive solution of several of the points of composition of the work is still lacking. Frappier tends to explain the disparity generally noticed between the different parts of the *Concorde* by that peculiar feature observed in pre-Renaissance literature and art, where rather heterogeneous elements are soldered together without being entirely fused. However, the fact remains that the *Temple de Minerve* is considerably shorter than the *Temple de Vénus*, that the *Temple de Minerve* fails noticeably both in inspiration and in richness and finish of workmanship, and that it comes closer to a *pièce de circonstance* than its counterpart.

Frappier has made an outstanding contribution to the understanding of the *Concorde* in his excellent introduction and his revealing notes. He brings out the importance of Lyons as a center of and model for the harmonious union of French and Italian cultures. He treats the curious assimilation of mediaeval allegory and ancient mythology in the *Concorde*. He makes a brilliant analysis of the themes, literary, philosophical-moral, and political, woven into the work. He points out that there is syncretism rather than fusion in the ideas found in Lemaire, and indeed throughout the sixteenth century. In this reviewer's opinion, it is not generally realized that the coexistence, in a certain age or within the same person, of several ideas based on premises mutually contradictory, should be accepted as a natural psychological phenomenon, and that it is not the business of the historian to look for logical consistencies and to try to reconstruct a "fusion" or a "synthesis," which in actuality seldom exists, especially in a period like the Renaissance. Frappier rightly (in my opinion) adopts the notions of syncretism and assimilation as against those of synthesis and fusion in regard to both ideas and mythological material. While he carefully keeps Lemaire de Belges in the pre-Renaissance limbo, he stresses his important break from the *rhétoriqueurs* and his daring originality. This needs to be re-emphasized, for there is the temptation among critics now and then to rehabilitate bad poets, especially those of the school of the *rhétoriqueurs*. Conversely, Frappier corrects the rather unfair treatment Lemaire had received at the hands of Brunot. He shows how Lemaire not only is a serious precursor of the Pléiade, but at times goes farther than they do, as in the freedom of his imitation of the ancients, and how Lemaire, in his discussion of the respective merits of French and Italian cultures and languages, reveals "un esprit de générosité intellectuelle et . . . une bonne foi qu'on ne gardera pas toujours par la suite."

The notes in which Frappier gives, among other valuable explanatory information, the main sources through which the poet received the revelation of the mythological and symbolic world of antiquity, indicate that the concordance between classical and mediaeval, Italian and French cultures had already been experienced by Lemaire himself as an individual. To this not only his readings but also his travels and his interest in painting and the other arts contributed considerably. It is characteristic of Lemaire's notion of poetry that Frappier finds the word *poésie* three years earlier than the year 1514, at which its first appearance is recorded by Bloch and Dauzat.

One or two remarks on the excellent glossary accompanying the text and the

notes: On the word *paranymphe*, the editor, instead of stressing the meaning it had in the French universities at the time, might have stressed the meaning it has in the original language, "best man of the bridegroom," which best fits Genius and his speech. On the word *extrinsecque*, as used in V, line 352, I cannot resist making a *rapprochement* with the semantic development of the English word "fetching," especially in view of the context:

> Lors Pasithée, en regardz extrinsecques,
> Attrait maint homme, et sa seur Egÿalle
> Les entretient par maintz plaisans obsecques.
> (Lines 352-354)

Frappier, in this critical edition, has rendered notable service to the students of Lemaire de Belges, and has helped to bring into clearer focus many aspects of Lemaire's work and of that vaguely delimited period, the French pre-Renaissance.

PANOS PAUL MORPHOS
Tulane University

MESA. A periodical edited and published by Herbert Steiner, State College, Pa. I, 1945; II, 1946; III, 1948. 46 p. each number.

The tall yellow issues of *Mesa* need some words of introduction. For this is not just another literary magazine. The editor, Dr. Herbert Steiner, is here continuing the work he started in Switzerland. At a time when all values were threatened, when the end of an era seemed near, *Corona* (1930-42) assembled the authors who still upheld values and traditions. The war intervened. The "table" with offerings (*Mesa*), that since has replaced the "wreath" (*Corona*), should arouse the interest of all comparatists. For it is the one literary journal in this country to appear in five languages, English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish. All its material has been unpublished up to now, or is unknown to the English-reading public.

No. I brings the first English translation of *Rabinal*, the ancient play of the Quiché Indians in Guatemala. It was a French abbé, Charles Brasseur de Bourbourg, perhaps the only white man to have witnessed a performance of it, who published the original text, along with a French translation in 1862. The version in *Mesa* (by Eleanor Wolff) is an abridged one, to a certain extent analogous to the excellent German translation by Eduard Stucken (*Die Opferung des Gefangenen*, 1913.) But a later, independent French version (by George Raynaud, of which, although unpublished, two Spanish renderings are available) has also been consulted, and many of the archaic repetitions have been restored in accordance with Brasseur and the original.

Free of all European influence, the play shines in Aeschylean beauty. It arouses keen speculations on the origin of the drama. For here we have music, dance, and ceremonial language centering around the sacrifice of a prisoner of war. Did tragedy perhaps supplant human sacrifices? Is this the reason why cruelty still lingers in its core? Was its first hero not the god himself but the deified victim on the altar of Dionysus? This would make *phobos* and *eleos* not only the effects but also the causes of tragedy.

Another contribution to *Mesa* (in No. III) consists of six letters from one of the significant documents of our era, the *Correspondence between Two Corners of a Room* (1920), for the first time translated into English (since then, another translation has followed). Vyacheslav Ivanov (d. 1949), a classical scholar and one of the first Russian symbolist poets, for many years an exile in Italy, and his chance roommate, the critic M. Gershenzon, are here amicably quarreling about culture—this system of coercions, or temptations, from which the mystic may at

any time escape into eternity, whereas the utopist will project the escape into the future.

In No. II, poets discuss their own *raison d'être*, the problem of form. Jorge Guillén, the Castilian (now teaching at Wellesley), who became famous by his one volume of poetry, *Cántico*, investigates the relationship of illumination and perfection, of art and soul, in the songs of San Juan de la Cruz; Paul Valéry, in the last of his essays on Mallarmé, shows levels of spirituality where consciousness controls inspiration; in some unpublished notes, the Viennese Richard Beer-Hofmann exemplifies as well as extols the "magical power of languages," a subject taken up again by an essay of Katherine G. Chapin, in No. III.

In each of the three issues there are poems—unpublished verse by Rilke(to be followed, in No. IV, by letters of his); verse by the Czech Otakar Brezina, by Guillén, Unamuno, Erich Kahler. St.-J. Perse, the Frenchman whose *Anabase* was translated into English by T. S. Eliot, contributes a new ballad, "Berceuse." Its enigmatic stanzas tell how the life of a royal infant was destroyed by the rites of an ancient society.

Since the editor of *Mesa* is also the editor of Hofmannsthal's works and papers, he is able to acquaint us with some letters by that great Austrian who stood for the threatened traditions of Europe. They have rare fragrance of simplicity and feeling, and are at the same time full of human and political insights.

Connected with the name of Hofmannsthal is that of his son-in-law, Heinrich Zimmer, an Orientalist who applied to Indian mythology the theory of C. G. Jung's archetypes. Up to his untimely death in 1943, he taught as a visiting professor at Columbia. (Among his posthumous books, *The King and the Corpse*, 1948, should attract the attention of Arthurian scholars!) In honor of his memory, *Mesa* publishes his "Träume eines Gottes," a Western legend in Eastern garb; an obituary outlines his exuberant personality.

This brief survey may suffice to show the aims of *Mesa*. Its name may indicate, too, a tableland, "un haut lieu," whence distant views become visible: one world, one literature! It is devoted to excellence both in form and contents, or rather it insists that no such division exists: "Nichts ist drinnen, nichts ist draussen. Denn was innen, das ist aussen." Handprinted by Victor and Jacob Hammer, the periodical is an example of consummate craftsmanship.

This new periodical is the work of one solitary man unconcerned with the literary market—the labor of love of one who loves poetry.

HELEN ADOLF

Pennsylvania State College

BYRON, HOBHOUSE AND FOSCOLO. By E. R. P. Vincent. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1949. vii, 134 p.

Questo volume su Foscolo è il benvenuto, sia perché ci mette sotto gli occhi, in uno schema ordinato, numerosi documenti sconosciuti, sia perché preannunzia e promette un lavoro più completo, del medesimo autore, su Foscolo nella società inglese. Si sa che il periodo zurighese e il periodo inglese della vita di Foscolo hanno ancora molto bisogno di essere illuminati; e per il secondo, il miglior modo di porre in luce i documenti di cui disponiamo è di dedurne la posizione del poeta italiano nell'ambiente nel quale si trovò e che lo condizionò psicologicamente e praticamente in modo assai considerevole.

Nel libro del Vincent, di questo studio abbiamo per così dire un esperimento lineare: cioè la traccia dei rapporti fra il Foscolo e un letterato inglese, J. Hobhouse, colui che redasse in inglese le osservazioni del Foscolo sulla letteratura italiana per le note al byroniano *Childe Harold*. Questa traccia è desunta dai

materiali forniti dalla preziosa scoperta di un diario dello stesso Hobhouse, in cui sono registrati con sorprendente vivezza alcuni colloqui con Foscolo ed episodi della sua vita in Inghilterra; e di un gruppo di lettere di Foscolo a Hobhouse, delle quali una ventina sconosciute o imperfettamente pubblicate. Se la traccia è lineare, nel senso che designa solo i rapporti fra Foscolo e Hobhouse, senza indulgere ad eccessive diramazioni o divagazioni, è nondimeno certo una delle direttive fondamentali della futura costruzione, se non addirittura il fusto.

I documenti sono disposti in un testo che apparentemente solo li collega. E in questa leggerezza di mano, si dimostra l'esperienza raffinatissima e il buon gusto del critico. Non ci si accorge delle cuciture, degli accorgimenti tipografici, del corredo sobrio ma sufficiente delle note, se non quando vi ricorriamo; ma soprattutto la presentazione è ben calcolata: così misurata e così modesta, che è quasi impossibile sfuggire all'ordine, in realtà assai rigoroso, in cui i documenti sono scelti e concatenati, allo schema invisibile ma presente sui cui si fonda la ricostruzione. L'eloquenza stessa dei documenti, d'altronde, giustifica in modo continuo quell'ordine e anche, salvo minime sfumature, l'interpretazione.

Ordine e interpretazione dei documenti mettono in luce in sostanza la conoscenza e amicizia fra Foscolo e Hobhouse, la loro collaborazione nel *Saggio* del *Childe Harold*, la loro comune difesa al noto attacco del Di Breme, i loro scambi d'opinioni; poi lo screzio dovuto a cause finanziarie, il riavvicinamento, il distacco con l'episodio considerevole della richiesta di matrimonio sporta dal Foscolo quarantaseenne alla ventitreenne Matilda Hobhouse; tutto ciò con ricchezza di particolari indicativi, concernenti i movimenti, le abitudini, le altre conoscenze inglesi del Foscolo.

Le cose che colpiscono sono molte in questa serie di testimonianze; ne segnaleremo alcune delle più interessanti. Anzitutto, la luce che si fa sopra la questione del già citato saggio sulla letteratura italiana scritto dal Foscolo e ridotto in inglese da Hobhouse. È nota la lettera in cui Foscolo formalmente nega (indirizzandosi al Pellico, in data 30 settembre 1818) di avere mai scritto quel saggio. Questa lettera era combinata con Hobhouse: in una missiva a quest'ultimo, in data 3 febbraio 1819, dice il Foscolo rammentando i particolari di quell'avventura: "Nous nous sommes concertés de soutenir que j'ignorais l'origine de l'Essai, et que je le croyais vôtre ouvrage."[1] E continua, alludendo evidentemente al Pellico e al Di Breme: "J'ai honte de tenir aujourd'hui un langage différent et de dire à mes amis et à mes ennemis: *Je vous en ai menti.*" Così il nome del Foscolo non fu mai fatto, nonostante che allo Hobhouse ciò non piacesse; lo Hobhouse non gradiva fra l'altro le lodi non meritate, e nel suo diario se ne lascia spesso sfuggire espressioni evidenti: "It has brought upon me ... what is worse, praises where I do not deserve them."

Molte opinioni dal Foscolo enunciate in conversazione sono state fermate al volo dallo stesso Hobhouse e annotate nel diario. Si noti per esempio: "He [Foscolo] thought it a new observation that the greater writers of poetry have never laid down rules for their art,—the secondary always have." "He thought we had no critics except Campbell." "We had a dispute about the origin of the words *Mela cotogna*. W[ilbraham] thought it the cotton-down of the quince. Foscolo *malum cydonium*" (si noti la priorità di questa etimologia, cfr. *REW* 2436) "... he said ... that they [Whigs] sacrifice their principles to their party and their party to some individuals of their party." "Foscolo said religion was a sentiment like love—man had want of it." "He did not understand Shakespeare, but admired some passages. I quoted the moonlight *sleeping* on the bank. Foscolo said sleep was too strong for Italians; *repose* they might say. He said poetry was *images*"

[1] In questa e nelle altre citazioni è mantenuta inalterata la grafia originale riprodotta dal Vincent.

(si noti il commento di Hobhouse: "to be sure, Foscolo does not understand English").

E come le opinioni, ci rimangono alcune delle sue immagini: "Napoleon's dominion was like a July day in Egypt—all clear brilliant and blazy; but all silent, not a voice heard, the stillness of the grave"; come i suoi vezzi: "Showed us calculations in economy tending to show the enormous expense of England"; e delle vivissime coloriture, subitanee, del suo carattere: "F. told us a girl of 22 with £ 24000 wanted to marry him— we advised him so to do—as said he *je ne suis pas amoureux*." Fortissime possono essere le istantanee di questo diario; una è la disputa finanziaria fra i due, e mostra come la sensibilità all'insulto fosse acuta nel poeta, specie di fronte alla momentanea insensibilità, e alla forse involontaria grossezza dell'interlocutore: "*Tuesday, Dec. 15, 1818.* Foscolo flung out of my room to-day in a rage because I said *il ne faut pas me gener.*"

Non importa insistere oltre sul valore rappresentativo di queste pagine, né su quello delle lettere foscoliane che qui vedono la luce. Basta pensare all'agitata vicenda che rispecchiano, alla diretta passione con cui il Foscolo la soffriva, e all'esaltazione con cui ne vedeva le minacce e i pericoli senza tuttavia sapersene liberare, per immaginarne l'intensità. Queste lettere s'inseriscono con pieno diritto fra le più interessanti, e alcune fra le più belle, dell'epistolario foscoliano. E l'insieme delle notizie che questo libro ci porta non può che farci sperare presto nell'altro libro che si preannuncia; e dal quale attendiamo la necessaria sistemazione del problema biografico del Foscolo in Inghilterra.

Fredi Chiappelli

Università di Lausanne e Neuchâtel

Bibliography of Comparative Literature. By Fernand Baldensperger and Werner P. Friederich. University of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature. Chapel Hill, 1950. xxiv, 701 p.

The *Bibliography of Comparative Literature*, a stout volume of 700 pages edited by M. Baldensperger, the dean of French comparatists, and Mr. Friederich of the University of North Carolina, is ostensibly a revision of L. P. Betz's *La Littérature comparée. Essai bibliographique* (Strasbourg, 1900), which M. Baldensperger had himself revised and published in an expanded edition in 1904, after the untimely death of its originator. M. Baldensperger kept a revision in mind for many years and collected many items; when he left Harvard University in 1940 he presented a catalogue with some 15,000 slips to Widener Library, where the trays were in public use as late as 1945. Mr. Friederich has since taken over M. Baldensperger's work and expanded it greatly. There are, he tells us, 33,000 items in his *Bibliography*. This is not only more than double the number of M. Baldensperger's collections; it also represents a very considerable labor of revision and checking, since M. Baldensperger's files at Harvard University Library were, when I used them in 1945, very far from ready for printing.

Mr. Friederich can be proud of his achievement. He has given all students of comparative literature and actually all students of literature an invaluable, indispensable tool, an up-to-date, very full, and generally accurate survey of all scholarship which can be called comparative literature. The standard of accuracy, considering the number of items, in many different languages, seems to be extraordinarily high, to judge from constant use over several months. The arrangement, which repeats Betz's scheme with some modifications, seems lucid and logical, once one has grasped the main principle that always the "emitter" of an influence is the guide for the listing. There are a few misfilings but their number, I believe, is very small—though many titles are obscure and ambiguous.

A work such as this has the privilege of having lacunae, and inevitably it carries along a considerable amount of dead wood. As far as I can generalize, it would have been better to omit a rather large number of items drawn from newspapers, most of which have only slight value and clutter up a good many pages. We could also spare such items as "The intrinsic adolescent appeal in the study of Greek" (p. 271). Apart from such flaws, however, there are two major weak spots in the book.

General literature, questions of the theory of literature, genres, etc., are covered far less satisfactorily than thematology *(Stoffgeschichte)* or literary relations between two or more literatures. The reasons for this weakness is obvicus to anyone who has ever tried to compile a bibliography of this scope. It is relatively easy to catch items which, by names in the title, define the subject, while one would almost always need a firsthand knowledge of the literature in order to accumulate a bibliography of theoretical and general problems. For the same reason the subject listings in catalogues of libraries are always much less satisfactory than the titles under the names of authors. Still, even if this difficulty is recognized, the *Bibliography* has surprising gaps on some points. A weak section is that on the main literary genres (pp. 179 ff). There, to give a few examples, we miss under "Ballad" the standard books by G. H. Gerould (*The Ballad of Tradition*, 1932) and Louise Pound (*Poetic Origins and the Ballad*, 1921); under "Biography" all books on American biography, the book by D. Stauffer on *English Biography before 1700*; under "dialogue" the fundamental book by R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog*, 2 vols. (1895), etc., etc. Chapter II (pp. 189 ff.) opens with a general section on literary genres. None of the German discussions such as those by Günther Müller, K. Viëtor, and J. Petersen are included, and even Brunetière and the books by Robert Hartl, Miss Behrens, and others are absent. The section on the novel (pp. 195 ff.) is particularly defective; many books which would immediately occur to any student of the novel in English are not listed: nothing by J. W. Beach, E. M. Forster, P. Lubbock, E. Muir, or Henry James, who would all deserve a place on the smallest list. Among French books on the novel neither Mauriac nor Thibaudet is present, and *Die Theorie des Romans* by G. Lukacs is missing among the German items. The list of general works on literary criticism (pp. 203 ff.) is also quite small and defective. Only one article by Croce is listed (*La Criticia letteraria*, 1894, at least should be included); and the list of individual critics is so small and arbitrary that it is almost meaningless. Neither Arnold nor Coleridge nor Sainte-Beuve nor De Sanctis appear, and writings on T. S. Eliot as a critic are represented by only one piece in the *Arizona Quarterly*, though there have been several discussion in book form (Ants Oras, Victor Brombert, M. C. Costello) and many articles. The section on versification, metaphors, etc. (p. 210) is also very thin; as to English metrics, not even the standard works by Verrier, Scripture, George Stewart, Schramm, and Osmond are listed. We find hardly anything on metaphor, not even H. Pongs, Wells, Stanford, or Heinz Werner. Under "Imagery" (p. 184) we find only three items.

The part on "Literature and Politics" (pp. 12 ff.), which opens with a chapter on sociology and lists Marxism expressly among its topics, is possibly even more deficient. One misses all the standard Marxist discussions available in the Western languages (e. g., Plekhanov, Trotsky, Iskowicz, Mehring, Lukacs, Cauldwell) and there is hardly any of the literature of the non-Marxist approach to the problem of "literature and society."

A second major deficiency of the work is the stepmotherly treatment of Slavic matters. Slavic items are confined almost entirely to those in Western languages; a few items in the original languages are quoted, but, oddly enough, mostly in English, German, French, or even Italian translation. The oddity is increased by the

divergences of transliteration even of the same name from Slavic languages with the Russian alphabet. An attempt should surely be made to standardize the transcriptions, to give the titles in the original languages, and to add to their very small number. Inter-Slavic relations are hardly treated at all, and Slavic items are almost completely absent from the sections on general literature. There is a very rich Russian, Polish, and Czech literature on questions of comparative literature, oral literature, literary forms and genres, which is not represented at all in the *Bibliography*.

Mr. Friederich promises a supplement to the volume in five years, which will include additions and correct errors and omissions. His appeal for help (send communications to Box 775, Chapel Hill, N. C.) should be answered by everyone who has noticed errors, omissions, and misprints. The work could be made nearly perfect by small corrections, if substantially supplemented in the two directions I have indicated—literary theory and Slavic titles.

R. W.

J. J. Rousseau en Angleterre au XVIII[e] siècle. By Henri Roddier. Études de Littérature Étrangère et Comparée. Paris: Boivin et Cie., 1950. 435 p.

The history of Rousseau's impact on England in the eighteenth century is a subject of such obvious importance that it is rather remarkable that it has hitherto been studied only in segments and that no one before M. Roddier has ventured on a comprehensive survey. It would seem that the difficulties of the task have discouraged scholars from attempting it. Assessing the influence of such a paradoxical and instable literary personality is no easy matter, and the historian has to be alert to recognize the partial interpretations of Rousseau's works, the exploitation of certain ideas contained in them for the purposes of the controversies of the moment, as well as the vogues of some misinterpretations.

Some English readers of *La Nouvelle Héloïse*, for instance, passed lightly over the initial episode of Julie's transgression with St. Preux, which they felt might well have been excised from the novel in the interests of morality, but were delighted with the account of Julie's conquest over herself. Such readers thought that the novel, in spite of its unfortunate blemish at the beginning, was an edifying vindication of the conventions, very suitable as a help in bringing up young girls—and thus they had a Rousseau to their liking. But there were other readers, including Byron, who preferred to have their souls caught up in the storm of the grand passion and were only bored by Julie *sermonneuse*. Thus we already have two Rousseaus; and, when we begin to describe and define influence and reputation, all his works seem to divide and multiply in the same way.

M. Roddier has attempted to record these English reactions to the multiple aspects of Rousseau down to the end of the eighteenth century. He acknowledges his indebtedness, especially for the earlier section, to recent publications of limited scope by two American scholars, J. E. Warner and R. B. Sewall, but he has adopted their conclusions only after independent investigation. Like them, he has exploited the running commentary on Rousseau in English periodicals and in controversial books and pamphlets. But it is a special feature of his work that he has gone further in his explanation of each incident in his history by attempting to recall the state of the public mind and the question of the hour to which the immediate argument over Rousseau might have pertinence.

As an illustration of this method: the *Contrat Social* was reviewed enthusiastically by Kenrick in the *Monthly Review* in December 1762, and rather caustically in the conservative *Critical Review* in November 1763. The two journals represented, of course, two different segments of public opinion. But

M. Roddier presents in a few pages an account of the Wilkes affair, then the most acute political question before the public, and introduces what I believe is conclusive evidence that the adherents of Wilkes were so enthusiastic over the *Contrat Social* because they could find in it theoretical support in this particular political battle, and, moreover, that they interpreted Rousseau's political theory in the light of their own conception of the English constitution after the Revolution of 1688.

Throughout his monograph M. Roddier thus weaves his story of Rousseau into the English background. The reception of *La Profession de Foi* is involved in the Methodist question and the controversies of Warburton. The early reputation of the two *Discourses* cannot be dissociated from Burke's *Vindication of Natural Society* (1756), John Brown's *Estimate* (1757), and the developments of Scottish philosophy, especially Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759). In the course of his survey M. Roddier gives an account, period by period, sometimes almost year by year, of the eddies and currents of English thought and sentiment so far as they are pertinent to explaining the reputation of Rousseau. This richness of detail is perhaps the distinguishing merit of the monograph. Students of English literary history will here find many a publication assuming new significance as it is brought into relation with the diffusion of Rousseau's ideas.

There is a further difficulty confronting the student of this subject in the fact that most of the controversial ideas and tendencies in Rousseau's work were already familiar in English thought before Rousseau began his first *Discourse*. When Rousseau's influence blends with these, how can it possibly be distinguished and assessed? Of course, in the many cases where an English writer specifically mentions Rousseau, the fact of the contact of minds is established and one may proceed to state its significance. But there are also many important cases of parallelism in which the scholar can only rely on a delicate act of judgment and then make his conclusion as rhetorically persuasive as possible. He may affirm confidently that we "surely" or "indubitably" have a case of Rousseauistic influence, or he may put to the reader the question how the Englishman could possibly have written as he did without reference to the current Rousseau controversy. The reader may or may not assent. M. Roddier agrees with Mr. Sewall that, even before the *Second Discourse* was translated into English, its influence as a provocation is to be detected in Burke's *Vindication of Natural Society* (1756) and Johnson's *Rasselas* (1759). The parallels seem to me to make the argument plausible but not conclusive. Goldsmith offers a similar difficulty. M. Roddier analyzes *The Vicar of Wakefield* as "le tableau idyllique du bonheur domestique" (p. 89), although this description is qualified and to some extent contradicted on the next page. Having concluded on this doubtful evidence that the novel is an instance of Rousseau's influence, M. Roddier goes on to ask regarding *The Deserted Village*, "doit-il quelque chose à Rousseau? Il serait difficile de le nier tout à fait si l'on accorde la justesse des précédentes analyses" (p. 91). True enough, but it is equally difficult to affirm it Had we not had the tradition that the portrait of the village pastor was drawn from Goldsmith's father we might easily attribute it to a "rêve Rousseauiste." It would be easy to gather an abundance of passages of Rousseauistic flavor even from the English predecessors of Rousseau. Nevertheless it must also be recognized that any student of Rousseau's reputation has to note all significant parallels, give them such weight as he judges proper, and then leave the matter to the consensus of opinion of the scholarly world.

Specialists in this period will be grateful to M. Roddier for this excellent

monograph, the result of years of research and reflection, and perhaps those who may disagree with him on certain specific points will be most deeply in his debt.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

University of Michigan

DANTE AND VIRGIL. By J. H. Whitfield. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1949. 106 p.

Professor Whitfield's volume contains a miscellany of four unrelated essays, only the last of which deals with the problem stated in the title.

The first section, "Dante for the English," is a quick survey of the productions of some English translators of Italian poetry, containing scattered comments about their merits and about the problems of translating poetry in general, together with notes on the fluctuations of Dante's popularity in England. Following his remarks on the nature of good translating, Professor Whitfield offers a model for more satisfactory adaptation of the *Divine Comedy* to English, a new prose version of the first five cantos of *Inferno*. His aim here is a "fresh approach," which is apparently to consist of avoiding the use of archaic words and words "which are thought in themselves to have a poetic rank"; such a translation, he tells us, will "halt between prose and poetry." There is little to be said about the sample he offers. Though it is not badly executed as an exercise in translation, one cannot help questioning the freshness of the approach as well as the need for a new translation.

The third chapter of the volume bears the heading "Dante's Journey"; its content is extremely difficult to describe, for it is an assortment of facts, observations, and opinions pertaining to almost every possible phase of Dante scholarship. Most of the material is not new and a great deal of it is superficial, but it must be remembered that the author wishes here to present only "a survey of his [Dante's] poem which is intelligible to those who are not already acquainted with the *Comedy*, or even with Italian." Subjects discussed include external structure and "plot," the symbolism of various events and figures, general allegorical content, theological problems, political views, and scattered details of poetic method. A reader completely unfamiliar with the *Commedia* will surely be lost in this *mélange*, whereas one who has read the poem with the aid of any standard set of notes will gain little from it.

These three sections of the volume contain some material suitable for classroom lectures to beginning Dante students; indeed, one suspects that such was their origin. They seem hardly worthy of inclusion with the interesting study which follows them.

In his fourth essay Professor Whitfield comes at last to the subject of Dante and Virgil. The problem he has undertaken here, one touched upon by other scholars but seldom if ever treated with any care, is the examination of the "achievements and ideals" of the two poets, comparing their purposes, methods, and viewpoints to determine whether they are really alike as poets and, if so, to what extent and in what ways. The following paragraphs will serve as a résumé of the more interesting and important observations.

It has long been clear that Dante uses much Virgilian material, but in the very passages which are most Virgilian we see that the style of the two poets is very different. In the *Aeneid*, similes are used to enhance an incident, to give an overtone of color; the elements of Virgil's imagery are necessarily important or pleasing in themselves. But with Dante the problem was not one of descriptive overtones; the imagery of the *Commedia* serves to bring strange and incomprehensible things down to the level of the familiar and to give clarity, or an illusion of clarity, to a world otherwise vague and nebulous. Thus Dante uses not only humble but

sometimes coarse and trivial objects and actions in the similes which explain his poetic world.

Virgil's primary intent is the narration of the height of human achievement, of the building of a great civilization under which the Golden Age was being re-created. He is the poet of peace and of building, of contentment with the world. The heroic action of the *Aeneid*, as the history of this achievement, requires the most elevated and noble style. Dante's essential purpose is to point the way, not to civil perfection, but to spiritual salvation, and he deals with the former only as a means to the latter. But that is not to say that he is not vitally concerned with the state of contemporary affairs. To him, the world has gone wrong. There is an ideal order for the world but it has not been maintained; if man would accept the right authorities and return to that order, the world would be right again. Professor Whitfield summarizes: "For Virgil, there was something wrong in the past, and Rome had transcended it: for Dante, there is something wrong in the present and Italy (or mankind) should abandon it" (p. 93).

The *lacrimae rerum*, sometimes taken as a keynote of Virgil's poetry, are really only for incidental things;

> "longa est iniuria, longae
> Ambages; *sed summa sequar fastigia rerum.*"

And since we are progressing toward the heights, heroic deeds and the fame of noble men are to be praised. Compare Dante's violent apostrophes to Florence and to all Italy with Virgil's satisfaction with the Roman world. The Tiber is *caelo gratissimus amnis*, whereas the Arno, every bit as beloved to the later poet, has become a *maladetta e sventurata fossa* because nothing is really right.

So while Virgil praises, exalts, and glorifies, adding an occasional note of pity for things that are necesarily wrong, Dante indignantly condemns. This basic difference in outlook accounts for important differences in style. Where Virgil's poetry most frequently brings us a view from a distance in order to magnify, Dante brings us a close-up view in order to stigmatize; these are Professor Whitfield's phrases and he chooses as an example the comparison of Virgil's description of the mutilated Deiphobus (*Aeneid*, VI) with Dante's description of Mahomet in the bolgia of the schismatics. Virgil emphasizes not the details of Deiphobus' slashed ears and nose but the pity which they evoke in Aeneas and their wrongness. In the world of the *Commedia* this effect would be useless because the tortures of Hell are good and must not inspire pity. They are the operation of the *contrappasso* and without them divine justice would be inarticulate. Dante therefore emphasizes the horrors of infernal suffering, and the language he chooses to use for this purpose is, in comparison with Virgil's, coarse and vulgar. He does not hesitate to use obscenity when it will serve his purpose effectively.

Professor Whitfield has examined the poetry of Dante and Virgil "with a view to their essence, rather than with a view to the ways in which they combine." His essay contains much that might best have been omitted, much rambling comment on past scholarship and on irrelevant details. The style is far too undisciplined. But, regardless of these blemishes, the pages devoted to Dante and Virgil contain some stimulating ideas based on the perception of significant differences. Though Dante established a lasting union of his name with that of Virgil, the two poets looked in opposite directions.

BETTIE MAE HALL PAYNE

The Johns Hopkins University

BOOKS RECEIVED

Adams, H. H., and B. Hathaway (editors). Dramatic Essays of the Neoclassic Age. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. xix, 412 p.

Bertini, G. M., and R. Radicati (editors). Testi spagnoli del secolo XV°. Turin: Gheroni, 1950. 187p.

Delakas, Daniel L. Thomas Wolfe, la France et les romanciers français. Paris: Jouve & Cie, 1950. xii, 155 p.

Diderot, Denis. Pensées Philosophiques. Édition critique avec introduction, notes et bibliographie par Robert Niklaus. Geneva: Droz; Lille: Giard, 1950. xxvi, 68 p.

Falcionelli, A. Nuevos puntos de vista sobre la "Cartuja de Parma" y las ideas de Stendhal. Mendoza: Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, 1949. xvi, 191 p.

Figueiredo, Fidelino de. A Luta pela expressão (Prolegómenos para uma Filosofia da Literatura). Coimbra: Nobel, 1944. 215 p.

Figueiredo, Fidelino de. Shakespeare e Garrett. Guimarães: Revista de Guimarães, 1950. 60 p.

Hall, Vernon, Jr. Life of Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484-1558). Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1950. (Transactions, N. S., Vol. 40, Part 2, pp. 83-170).

Heffner, R.-M.S., and W. P. Lehmann. A Word-Index to the Poems of Walther von der Vogelweide. 2nd ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950. iv, 78 p.

La Gorce, Agnès de. Camisards et dragons du roi. Paris: Albin Michel, 1950. 363 p.

Meessen, H. J. (editor). Goethe Bicentennial Studies. By Members of the Faculty of Indiana University. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1950. 325 p.

Melchiori, Giorgio. Michelangelo nel settecento inglese. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1950. 118 p.

Pascal's Short Life of Christ. Translated with an Introduction by Emile Cailliet and John C. Blankenagel. Princeton: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1950. 39 p.

Richards, Marguerite L. Le Comique de Courteline. Montreal, 1950. 371 p.

Romanistisches Jahrbuch. I (1947-48). Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, Joachim Heitmann & Co., 1949. 387 p.

Smiley, Joseph Royall. Diderot's Relations with Grimm. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950. viii, 127 p.

Stutzer, Walter. Jean-Jacques Rousseau und die Schweiz: Zur Geschichte des Helvetismus. Basel, 1950. 107 p.

Überlieferung und Gestaltung: Festgabe für Theophil Spoerri zum sechzigsten Geburtstag. Zürich: Speer-Verlag, 1950. 206 p.

Thomas, J. Wesley. Amerikanische Dichter und die deutsche Literatur. Goslar: Volksbücherei Verlag, 1950. 176 p.

Wall, Vincent, and James Patton McCormick (editors). Seven Plays of the Modern Theater. New York: American Book Co., 1950. xx, 521 p.

Wade, Ira O. Voltaire's Micromégas: A Study in the Fusion of Science, Myth, and Art. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950. xiv, 190 p.

Wallerstein, Ruth. Studies in Seventeenth-Century Poetic. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1950. x, 421 p.